DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 151 HE 009 145

TITLE University Creation from Existing Institutions. Hearings Before the Committee on the District of Columbia, United States Senate, Ninety-Third Congress, Second Session on H.R. 15643.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on the District of Columbia.

PUB DATE Sep 74

NOTE 106p.; Not available in hard copy due to small print

AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Centralization; Community Colleges; Consolidated Schools; Employee Attitudes; *Federal Legislation; Hearings; *Higher Education; Land Grant Universities; Mergers; *Organizational Change; Problems; Public Officials; Teacher Attitudes; Teachers Colleges; Technical Institutes; Trustees; *University Administration

IDENTIFIERS *College Mergers; District of Columbia Teachers College; Federal City College; *University of the District of Columbia; Washington Technical Institute

ABSTRACT

The contents of H.R. 15643 and the transcript of hearings held on it are presented. The bill proposes consolidation of Federal City College, the Washington Technical Institute, and the District of Columbia Teachers College into a single land-grant university. Witnesses include faculty members, administrators, and trustees of the three original institutions, labor representatives, and D.C. officials. (MSE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

LC1421 .U14215

UNIVERSITY CREATION FROM EXISTING INSTITUTIONS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 15643

TO CONSOLIDATE FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE, THE WASHINGTON TECHNICAL INSTITUTE, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS COLLEGE INTO A SINGLE LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY

SEPTEMBER 5, 1974

Printed for the use of the
Committee on the District of Columbia

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE009145

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
39-785 O WASHINGTON : 1974

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri, *Chairman*

DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii
ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, Illinois
JOHN V. TUNNEY, California
CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr., Maryland
DEWEY F. BARTLETT, Oklahoma
PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico

ROBERT HARRIS, *Staff Director and General Counsel*
ANDREW E. MANATOS, *Associate Staff Director*
COLBERT I. KING, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

BILL

Page

H.R. 15643 2

WITNESSES

Apperson, George W., president, Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO 36
Barry, Marion, Jr., former president, District of Columbia Board of Education 27
Brent, Dr. Joseph, faculty member, Federal City College 55
Cassara, Dr. Beverly, dean of graduate school, Federal City College 55
Cassell, Charles I., president, OPEN (Organization for Political Equality Now) 44
Dennard, Dr. Cleveland, president, Washington Technical Institute 75
Prepared statement 82
Fox, Richard K., Jr., vice chairman, District of Columbia Board of Higher Education 39
MacKenzie, John R., director, Labor Studies Office, Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO 36
Linton, Ron, citizen of the District of Columbia 90
Prepared statement 92
Mandle, Dr. William D., president, District of Columbia Teachers College Faculty Federation Local 2251, American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO 48
Prepared statement 51
Parker, Dr. Marjorie H., member, District of Columbia City Council 21
Prepared statement 29
Robbins, Louis P., assistant corporation counsel 52
Russell, Dr. Wendell, president, Federal City College and District of Columbia Teachers College 55
Prepared statement 65
Sisco, Mrs. Jean, vice chairman, Board of Trustees, Washington Technical Institute 75
Weaver, George L. P., president, Board of Trustees, Washington Technical Institute 75
Williams, Dr. Ronald, provost, Federal City College 55

MATERIAL SUBMITTED

Butler, James D., dean, School of Liberal and Fine Arts, Federal City College, letter, August 7, 1974 73
Cooke, Paul Phillips, National Board member, American Veterans' Committee, retired president, D.C. Teachers College, prepared statement 98
Gatling, Joseph T., chairman, Peoples Government Association, Federal City College, letter, July 26, 1974 70
Joseph, James E., chairman, Federal City College Faculty Organization, letter, August 9, 1974 74

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

Abolishment of boards 42
Against bill 47
All programs should be reviewed 40
All students deserve equal support 22
Allows for city council amendments 43

	Page
Amendments suggested	24, 36, 40
Annual report	47
Appropriateness of remarks	47
Approval by newly elected city council	53
Authority of city council	80
Authority to establish a foundation	38
Avoid waste and duplication	76
Bill is untimely	44
Bill should be filed	90
Board of Education timetable	53
Board of Trustees	46
Campaign pledges	50
Circumventing local elected government	45
City council could not act rapidly	76
City council supports consolidation	21
City representatives should make decision	77
Community vocational college and university should be separate and distinct	62
Concerned about lame duck situation	76
Congress will still be involved	79
Congressional intervention	42
Consider the element of self-government	81
Contradicts the spirit of the home rule movement	63
Create a university that will be capable of serving any population	61
Different types of education	63
Education in the District of Columbia	54
Effect of delay	77
Federal versus local	75
Financing of the budget	80
Fund for university president	41
Funds should be available without necessity of appropriation	41
Glad to rely on judgment of local representatives	50
Gifts and contributions	42
Graduate and professional education	60
Guarantee collective bargaining	39
History of development of land-grant colleges	56
Home rule	26, 36, 44
H.R. 15643 returns to a position held a century ago	58
Including a community college into the university structure	61
Local elected government should play its legitimate role	47
Many differences of opinion	90
Many different suggestions	77
Matter for an elected local government	54
Meet changing needs	24
Merging	49
Morrill Land Grant College Act	55
Municipal institutions	25
Must compete for faculty	38
Must think in terms of broad- and long-range needs	59
Need for urgency	48
No detailed discussion by Washington community	54
Not ready to offer the doctorate	60
Not the appropriate moment	59
Opposes university as proposed	60
Orderly natural growth process	64
Pass or file	39, 50, 58, 60
Pending court suit	52
Practical situation	79
Prefers action by Congress	27
Process should be volatile and ongoing	24
Programs difficult to change	37
Proper function of local elected legislators	44
Public university mandated by Congress not mentioned	45
Recapitulates important errors made by public education	55
Reexamine provision	25
Residency	39
Restrictive residency requirement of trustees	37

	Page
Salaries	38
Shift from training to theory	57
Should not be encumbered with personnel system procedures	40
Should not be passed at this time	54
Should not wait	28
Simply being thrown together	61
State consent	41
Strengthen lines of communication	25
Teacher training programs	24
Teachers college will go out of existence	49
Time factor	27
Timing is unfortunate	59
Trustees should provide for expenditures	37
Unacceptable sections of the bill	46
University of Hawaii	77
University president should not be an officer of board of trustees	41
University status	64
Vocational and community colleges	62
What is the urgency	45
Who should enact legislation	42
Who should make the determination	39
Will of the people	26, 43, 50, 78, 79
Will provide a wide range of opportunity for residents	22
Willingness to wait	43
Wisconsin idea	58

UNIVERSITY CREATION FROM EXISTING INSTITUTIONS

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1974

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m. in room 6226, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Daniel K. Inouye, presiding.

Present: Senator Inouye.

Staff present: Robert Harris, staff director and general counsel; Andrew E. Manatos, associate staff director; and Colbert I. King, minority staff director.

Senator INOUYE. This morning's hearing before the U.S. Senate Committee on the District of Columbia is for the purpose of taking testimony on H.R. 15643, a bill to consolidate Federal City College, the Washington Technical Institute, and the District of Columbia Teachers College into a single land-grant university.

I now place in the record a copy of H.R. 15643.

[The bill referred to follows:]

93D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 15643

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 30, 1974

Read twice and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia

AN ACT

To reorganize public postsecondary education in the District of Columbia, establish a Board of Trustees, authorize and direct the Board of Trustees to consolidate the existing local institutions of public postsecondary education into a single Land-Grant University of the District of Columbia, direct the Board of Trustees to administer the University of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE, PURPOSE, AND DEFINITIONS

Sec. 101. Short title.
Sec. 102. Statement of purpose.
Sec. 103. Definitions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

TITLE II—BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Sec. 201. Membership.
Sec. 202. Suspension and removal.
Sec. 203. Compensation.
Sec. 204. The University of the District of Columbia.
Sec. 205. Duties of the Trustees.
Sec. 206. Personnel System.
Sec. 207. Transfer of functions, assets, and liabilities.
Sec. 208. Establishment of Land-Grant University.
Sec. 209. State consent.

TITLE III—AUTHORIZATIONS

Sec. 301. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 401. Meetings.
Sec. 402. Advisory Committees.
Sec. 403. Gifts and contributions.
Sec. 404. Annual report.
Sec. 405. New authority granted Board of Education.
Sec. 406. Authority of Council.
Sec. 407. Effective date.

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE, PURPOSES, AND DEFINITIONS

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 101. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Public Postsecondary Education Reorganization Act".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 102. It is the intent of Congress to authorize a public land-grant university through the reorganization of the existing local institutions of public post-secondary education in the District of Columbia. It is the clear and specific intent of the Congress that vocational and technological education within the University be given at all times its proper

priority in terms of funding with other units within the University, and that the land-grant funds be utilized by the University in accordance with the provisions of the Act of July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301–305, 307, 308) (known as the First Morrill Act).

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 103. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "Trustees" means the Board of Trustees established under title II of this Act.

(b) The term "President" means the chief executive and administrative officer of the University.

(c) The term "University" means the University of the District of Columbia authorized and directed to be established under title II of this Act.

(d) The term "Provost" means the academic and administrative head of each of the several colleges of the University.

(e) The term "Mayor" means the Mayor of the District of Columbia established by section 421 of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act.

(f) The term "Council" means the Council of the District of Columbia established by section 401 of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act.

(g) The term "Board of Higher Education" means the Board of Higher Education established under section 102 of the District of Columbia Public Education Act (D.C. Code, sec. 31-1602).

(h) The term "Vocational Board" means the Board of Vocational Education established under section 202 of the District of Columbia Public Education Act (D.C. Code, sec. 31-1622).

(i) The term "Board" means the District of Columbia Board of Education established under section 303 of the Elected-Board of Education Act (D.C. Code, sec. 31-101).

(j) The term "financial institution" means an insured bank as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, or a savings and loan association as defined in section 401 of the National Housing Act.

TITLE II—BOARD OF TRUSTEES

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby authorized to be established a University of the District of Columbia, which shall be an independent agency of the District of Columbia government, and which shall be governed by a Board of Trustees consisting of fifteen members selected according to the provisions of this section:

(1) Twelve members nominated by the Mayor, one of whom shall be a full-time student at the District of Columbia

Teachers College, or the Federal City College, or the Washington Technical Institute. Except for the student member, the nominees under this subsection shall be subject to Council confirmation.

(2) One member of the Trustees appointed by the Alumni Association of the District of Columbia Teachers College, with notice thereof to the Mayor within forty-five days after the effective date of this Act.

(3) One member of the Trustees appointed by the Alumni Association of the Federal City College, with notice thereof to the Mayor within forty-five days after the effective date of this Act.

(4) One member of the Trustees appointed by the Alumni Association of the Washington Technical Institute, with notice thereof to the Mayor within forty-five days after the effective date of this Act.

(5) In the event the alumni associations referred to in subsections (2), (3), and (4) of this section fail to submit an appointee within the time specified, the Mayor shall make the appointment.

(6) As the initial terms of the alumni members expire, the three alumni trustees shall be appointed by the Alumni Association of the University or the Mayor if no alumni association of such University exists.

(b) All nominations and appointments under this section shall be made not later than March 2, 1975. The terms of the members of existing Boards shall terminate on the day that the Trustees announce the consolidation has been effectuated, but in no event shall the terms terminate later than June 30, 1976.

(c) The Trustees shall hold the first meeting no later than April 2, 1975. The first meeting of the Trustees shall be convened by a member of the Trustees designated by the Mayor.

(d) The student member of the Trustees shall serve a one-year term of office; all other Trustees may be selected to serve one successive term.

(e) The terms of nonstudent Trustees shall be determined by lots cast at the first meeting of the Trustees, with the initial lots to provide:

(1) three shall serve terms of two years;

(2) three shall serve terms of three years;

(3) three shall serve terms of four years; and

(4) five shall serve terms of five years.

(f) Any Trustee selected to fill a vacancy shall be selected only for the remainder of the term for which his predecessor was selected and in the same manner as the original selection. A Trustee may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor has qualified to take office.

(g) A Chairman and Vice Chairman (1) shall be selected by the Trustees from among the District of Columbia resident members, (2) shall serve a one-year term as Chairman or Vice Chairman, (3) may be reappointed, and (4) cannot serve in such capacity beyond their term as member.

(h) All members selected to the Trustees shall have been domiciled in and residents of the District of Columbia for the twelve consecutive months preceding the date of their selection except that the Mayor may nominate not more than two persons to the Trustees who are not residents of the District of Columbia if, in his judgment, their nominations would enhance the Trustees.

(i) Members of the Trustees may be employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia government, unless they hold positions in clear conflict of interest.

(j) The president of the University shall be an ex officio member of the Trustees and shall serve as Secretary to the Trustees.

SUSPENSION AND REMOVAL

SEC. 202. Any Trustee shall be automatically suspended from serving as such member after he has been found guilty of a felony by a court of competent jurisdiction. Upon a final determination of his guilt or innocence, the term of such member shall automatically terminate or be reinstated.

COMPENSATION

SEC. 203. Trustees shall serve without compensation, but may be reimbursed for their expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at the maximum rate equal to the daily equivalent provided for by grade 18 of the General Schedule established under section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code, with a limit of $4,000 per annum, while actually engaged in service for the Trustees.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SEC. 204. The Trustees shall, by June 30, 1976, consolidate the existing three public institutions of postsecondary education in the District of Columbia into a single institution to be called the University of the District of Columbia, with several schools, colleges, institutes, campuses, and units that offer a comprehensive program of public postsecondary education. The institutions of public postsecondary education in the District of Columbia existing immediately prior to such consolidation shall be deemed abolished on the effective date of the consolidation. Thereafter, any reference in any law, rule, regulation, or other document of the United States or of the District of Columbia to such institutions shall be deemed to be a reference to the University of the District of Columbia.

DUTIES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

SEC. 205. It shall be the duty of the Trustees to—

(a) Review the existing public institutions of post-secondary education with respect to (1) accreditation, (2) present programs and functions, and (3) actual and potential capabilities. Those institutions and programs within such institutions that are determined to be sound and valid shall be used as a basis for the several schools, colleges, institutes, campuses, and units of the University, which shall include but not be limited to programs of science and technology, including but not limited to environmental sciences, liberal and fine arts, vocational and technical education and professional studies, including graduate programs, and postgraduate programs, except the programs of technical and vocational education of the Washington Technical Institute, are hereby determined to be sound and valid and shall be used as the basis for a unit of the University committed to furthering job oriented courses of study.

(b) Establish or approve policies and procedures governing admissions, curriculums, programs, graduation, the awarding of degrees, and general policymaking for the units of the University.

(c) Prepare and submit to the Mayor, on a date fixed by the Mayor, an annual budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1977. Such budget shall include a pro-

posed financial operating plan for such fiscal year, and a capital and educational improvements plan for such fiscal year and the succeeding four fiscal years for the University. The Mayor and the Council shall establish the maximum amount of funds which will be allocated to the Trustees for Higher Education, but may not specify the purposes for which such funds may be expended or the amount of such funds which may be expended for the various programs under the jurisdiction of the Trustees.

(d) The Trustees may transfer, during the fiscal year, any appropriation balance available for one item of appropriation to another item of appropriation or to a new program, in an amount not to exceed $50,000.

(e) Enter into negotiations and binding contracts pursuant to Council regulations regarding contracting with the governments of the United States and District of Columbia and other public and private agencies to render and receive services.

(f) Enter into negotiations and binding contracts pursuant to Council regulations to perform organized research, training, and demonstrations on a reimbursable basis for the United States and the government of the District of Columbia and other public and private agencies.

(g) Fix tuition for students attending the University

30-783 O - 74 - 2

with tuition charges to nonresidents being fixed as far as is feasible in amounts comparable to nonresident charges made by similar institutions.

(h) Fix fees, in addition to tuition, to be paid by resident and nonresident students attending the University. Receipts from these fees shall be deposited in a revolving fund in one or more financial institutions in the District of Columbia, and shall be available, when appropriated, for such purposes as the Trustees shall approve, without fiscal year limitation.

(i) Select, appoint, and fix the compensation for a President of the University and Provosts of the units of the University, and approve the appointment and compensation of such other officers as it deems necessary, including legal counsel.

(j) Procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at daily rates for individuals not in excess of the maximum daily rate for GS–18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title.

(k) Develop and define a policy governing academic freedom for the University and establish mechanisms to ensure its enforcement.

(l) Perform such other duties as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

PERSONNEL SYSTEM

SEC. 206. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Trustees are hereby authorized to establish, not earlier than one year and not later than five years after the effective date of this section, a personnel system (setting forth minimum standards) for all employees of units, facilities, and programs of the University, including, but not limited to, pay, contract terms, leave, residence, retirement, health and life insurance, employee disability, and death benefits, all at least equal to those provided by legislation enacted by Congress, or regulations adopted pursuant thereto, and applicable to such officers and employees immediately prior to the effective date of the system established pursuant to this section. Any provision in the personnel system established by the Trustees under this section requiring employees to be residents of the District of Columbia shall apply only to employees hired after the effective date of such system.

(b) The personnel policies of the Trustees shall incorporate Executive Order Numbered 70–229 of the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, as implemented by chapter 25A of the District Personnel Manual, or similar policies developed by the Trustees to guarantee collective-bargaining rights of employees subject to this section.

(c) Personnel legislation in effect prior to the establishment by the Trustees of such system, including without

limitation, legislation relating to appointments, promotions, discipline, separation pay, unemployment compensation, health disability and death benefits, leave, retirement, insurance, and veterans preference applicable to such employees, shall continue to be applicable until such time as the Trustees shall, pursuant to this section, provide for coverage under a new personnel system.

(d) All actions affecting such personnel and such members shall, until such time as a personnel system is established by the Trustees superseding such laws and establishing a permanent personnel system for all employees of the University continue to be subject to the provisions of Acts of Congress relating to the appointment, promotion, discipline, separation, and other conditions of employment applicable to officers and employees of the District government, and where applicable, to the provisions of the joint agreement between the Commissioners and the Civil Service Commission authorized by Executive Order Numbered 5491 of November 18, 1930, relating to the appointment of District personnel.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS, ASSETS, AND LIABILITIES

SEC. 207. The Board of Higher Education and the Vocational Board shall be abolished on the day the Trustees announce that the consolidation has been effectuated, but in no event shall the Boards be abolished later than June 30,

1976. Except as provided by this Act all functions, powers, and duties of the Board of Higher Education and the Vocational Board under the District of Columbia Public Education Act of 1966 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1601) shall be vested in and exercised by the Trustees. All employees, property (real and personal), and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and all other funds and assets and liabilities of the Board of Higher Education and Vocational Board are authorized to be transferred to the Trustees, except the functions of licensing institutions to confer degrees as authorized by Public Law 89–791 (D.C. Code, sec. 29–415).

ESTABLISHMENT OF LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY

SEC. 208. (a) In the administration of—

(1) the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321–326, 328) (known as the Second Morrill Act),

(2) the tenth paragraph under the heading "Emergency Appropriations" in the Act of March 4, 1907 (7 U.S.C. 322) (known as the Nelsen amendment),

(3) section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 329) (known as the Bankhead-Jones Act),

(4) the Act of March 4, 1940 (7 U.S.C. 331), and

(5) the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621–1627), the University shall be considered to be a university established for the benefit of agricul-

ture and the mechanic arts in accordance with the provisions of the Act of July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301–305, 307, 308) (known as the First Morrill Act); and the term "State" as used in the laws and provisions of law listed in the preceding paragraphs of this section shall include the District of Columbia.

(b) In the administration of the Act of May 8, 1914 (7 U.S.C. 341–346, 347a–349) (known as the Smith-Lever Act)—

(1) the University shall be considered to be a university established for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts in accordance with the provisions of the Act of July 2, 1862 (7 U.S.C. 301–305, 307, 308); and

(2) the term "State" as used in such Act of May 8, 1949, shall include the District of Columbia, except that the District of Columbia shall not be eligible to receive any sums appropriated under section 3 of such Act.

(c) In lieu of an authorization of appropriations for the District of Columbia under section 3 of such Act of May 8, 1914, there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to provide cooperative agricultural extension work in the District of Columbia under such Act. Such sums may be used to pay no more than one-half of the total cost of providing such extension work. Any reference in such

Act (other than section 3 thereof) to funds appropriated under such Act shall in the case of the District of Columbia be considered a reference to funds appropriated under this subsection.

(d) Four per centum of the sums appropriated under subsection (c) for each fiscal year shall be allotted to the Federal Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture for administrative, technical, and other services provided by the Service in carrying out the purposes of this section.

(e) The second sentence of the first section of the Act of March 2, 1887 (7 U.S.C. 361a–361i) is amended by inserting "(including the District of Columbia)" immediately after "the several States".

STATE CONSENT

SEC. 209. The enactment of this Act shall, as respects the District of Columbia, be deemed to satisfy any requirement of State consent contained in any of the laws or provisions of law referred to in section 209.

TITLE III—AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 301. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the purpose of this Act.

(b) The President is authorized to provide for the expenditure in amounts not to exceed $2,000 of funds for

such purposes as may be deemed necessary within limits that may be specified in annual appropriations. The President shall be personally responsible for the expenditure of appropriations made pursuant to this section, and such expenditures shall be supported by vouchers and shall be audited by the District of Columbia Auditor.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

MEETINGS

SEC. 401. Meetings may be called by the Chairman or a majority of the members of the Trustees. No official action may be taken by the Trustees except at a meeting of the Trustees at which a quorum is present. Eight members shall constitute a quorum but a lesser number may hold hearings. Each meeting of the Trustees shall be open to the public and held in the District of Columbia with appropriate notice of each such meeting given to the general public, except a majority of the Trustees may elect to go into executive session to take action on personnel matters.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

SEC. 402. The Trustees shall appoint such advisory committees as necessary to advise on educational policy. Such advisory committees may consist of members of the Trustees, students, faculty members, parents, governmental, educational, business, industrial, and community representatives.

GIFTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 403. The Trustees may accept services and moneys, including gifts or endowments, from any source whatsoever, for use in carrying out the purposes of this bill. Such moneys shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of a trust fund account which is hereby authorized and may be invested and reinvested as trust funds of the District of Columbia. The disbursement of the moneys from such trust funds, when appropriated, shall be in such amounts, to such extent, and in such manner as the Trustees, in their judgment, may determine necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 404. The Trustees shall make an annual report to the Congress, Mayor, Council, and the general public, on November 1 of each year, on the operation of programs and the expenditure of all funds for public higher education in the District of Columbia.

NEW AUTHORITY GRANTED BOARD OF EDUCATION

SEC. 405. (a) The Board may transfer, during the fiscal year, any appropriation balance available for one item of appropriation to another item of appropriation or to a new program, in an amount not to exceed $50,000.

(b) The Board may enter into negotiations and binding contracts pursuant to Council regulations regarding contract-

ing with the governments of the United States and District of Columbia and other public and private agencies to render and receive services.

AUTHORITY OF COUNCIL

SEC. 406. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, or any rule of law, nothing in this Act shall be construed as limiting the authority of the District of Columbia Council to enact any act or resolution, after January 2, 1975, pursuant to the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act with respect to any matter covered by this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 407. This Act shall take effect January 2, 1975.

Passed the House of Representatives July 29, 1974.

Attest: W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

Senator INOUYE. We will begin this morning's committee hearing with testimony from Dr. Marjorie H. Parker, member of the District of Columbia City Council.

Welcome, Dr. Parker, and please proceed.

STATEMENT OF DR. MARJORIE H. PARKER, MEMBER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CITY COUNCIL

Dr. PARKER. I believe you have copies of my prepared statement.

Senator INOUYE. If you wish, your full prepared statement will be made a part of the record.

Without objection, so ordered.

Dr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I am deeply appreciative of this opportunity to testify on behalf of the District of Columbia Council on proposed legislation to authorize a public land-grant university through the reorganization of the existing local institutions of public postsecondary education in the District of Columbia.

The committee should be congratulated on the expeditious manner in which public hearings have been scheduled following passage of H.R. 15643 by the House of Representatives.

As you have indicated, my name is Marjorie H. Parker. I am the chairman of the Council's Committee on Youth Education and Manpower. I also am a professional educator.

I have been employed in education since 1936 and for a great number of those years as an employee of the public schools of the District of Columbia, and more recently as an employee of the District of Columbia Teachers College.

I am at the present time chairman of the Division of Education and Psychology of the college. I want to make that clear as I want everybody to know that, so that I say this not in any apologetic way, although I have been accused of vested interest or of conflict of interest, I do not feel it that way.

I say this because I hope that this will help you to understand that I speak from personal experience, and I speak from a deep and sincere conviction of the urgency of the situation as far as higher education in the District of Columbia is concerned.

CITY COUNCIL SUPPORTS CONSOLIDATION

The District of Columbia Council strongly supports the consolidation of public higher education. Earlier this year public hearings were held at the invitation of Congressman Charles C. Diggs, chairman of the House District Committee, by a joint committee of the Board of Higher Education, the Board of Vocational Education, and the Council's Education, Youth Affairs, and Manpower Committee on a "Rough Discussion Draft To Reorganize Public Education in the District of Columbia."

A majority of those who testified supported the concept of a public university system in the District of Columbia.

The results of these hearings and a revised draft bill were transmitted to the chairman of the House District Committee as well as the Subcommittee on Education by the joint committee.

My testimony today will include the remarks I made on behalf of the Council before members of the House District Subcommittee on Education on July 1, 1974, with some additional comments on certain specifics now included in H.R. 15643.

The Council believes that a university system would provide a legal mechanism within which greater coordination, unification, and equalization of public higher education could be accomplished.

ALL STUDENTS DESERVE EQUAL SUPPORT

As an educator, a member of the District of Columbia Council—and with full Council support—I have tried to establish as public policy the position that all students enrolled at publicly supported institutions of higher education deserve equal support whether they desire to study in the areas of business management, computer science, the fine arts, or the teaching profession.

I spoke then to the funds that were in the appropriated budget these three various institutions had of higher education.

If a student goes to one, it is not fair in our opinion that one student should be supported at the cost of almost one and a half times the cost of another—not counting grants and specially funded projects, but simply the appropriated funds for higher education that are included in the budget of the District of Columbia.

Now, if you remember, the news media, and the various events of the spring, that was not universally well received. But the mayor did accept the principle, and he did promise the Council in his next budget he would work toward that principle.

Now, we see the organization of the university, and others have said the same thing, as a solution to that problem. Naturally, an inner city with a single administration, all students enrolled would then no longer be competing with one another for appropriated funds.

Now, at the present time there is a great disparity of funding between the three institutions with per student expenditures varying up to several thousand dollars.

A university of the District of Columbia seems to be the best hope for a more equitable distribution of funds and resources so as to provide equal educational opportunity with equal quality for all.

Creation of a university system should also further have cohesiveness of purpose and goals with regard to higher education by maximum utilization of available public funds.

WILL PROVIDE A WIDE RANGE OF OPPORTUNITY FOR RESIDENTS

A university system as conceived in H.R. 15643 with distinct colleges and schools, including graduate programs and post-graduate programs will provide a wide range of opportunity for all residents of the District of Columbia.

Students with varying abilities, but who for financial reasons cannot take advantage of the programs offered by the many fine universities in the area, will have access to a multiplicity of opportunities within the envisioned university.

I feel very strongly that the people of the District of Columbia have a right to look to the publicly supported university for post-secondary level education of a caliber equal to the finest privately supported institutions.

As you may know, Senator, for many years, in the District of Columbia, the only postsecondary education publicly supported was teacher training.

Now, there was a philosophical basis for this that does have some extensions in some schools of thought as far as education is concerned. That is that the higher education wherein the individual's talents are developed so that he better serves the community which has supported his instruction has a great deal to be desired. But I knew from many experiences, that I could recite to you, of very capable, intelligent, dedicated people who were interested and who were anxious for opportunities for higher education, but who simply were not of the personality, or of the inclination to become teachers. So this was one of the compelling reasons that led to the organization of the two institutions which now exist—the Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute. I could very strongly urge that this kind of a comprehensive postsecondary education is one of the greatest needs that we have in the District of Columbia at this time.

To create and sustain opportunities for quality education, we must bring together all elements now being supported by tax dollars.

A democracy depends upon the sound thought and judgment of all of its people for its strength. If the poor and middle class of our society are denied quality education, if only the rich can take advantage of education offered by universities of high caliber, then democracy passes out of the hands of the general public and that is true elitism and the death knell of a democratic state.

If West Point was a private tuition institution, so that only the wealthy could attend, our national military policy would be in the complete control of the privately rich.

So too, if we cannot offer public education to all equal to that afforded by the rich, our businesses, educational institutions, and governmental agencies will be in the control of our smallest minority.

Ideally, the District should, through a university system, offer the kind of education which would attract children of Congressmen, Senators, and Presidents as well as our other citizens.

I would hope to see the day that we would have a University of the District of Columbia of such a caliber that if Miss Suzanne Ford, who is finishing high school next year wished to stay at home and attend a public institution, she would find at the University of the District of Columbia the kind of programs that would fit her needs.

In examining the existing public institutions of secondary education and in determining which to be sound and valid, I believe a systematic, objective process should be used and that all the institutions should be required to undergo to the same process.

As you know, all three institutions are moving along and well.

In this day and time nearly every aspect of higher education is vocational—even the liberal arts. Unfortunately the time perhaps experienced in the days of Plato and Aristotle when people were able to study for the love of truth and knowledge alone is passed.

Almost all professionals return to the classroom to upgrade their skills. We should not be precipitous in deciding that certain courses of study are of such a sound or indeed ideal vocational nature that we freeze ourselves into rigid programs which cannot be changed as the need arises.

PROCESS SHOULD BE VOLATILE AND ONGOING

It is my understanding that there is a section in the bill which suggests the present offerings at Washington Technical are satisfactory and should not be further evaluated and should not be changed.

Now, inasmuch as these offerings were developed on the basis of computerized extrapolations of data related to the present and future employment potential in the Washington area, it seems to me such a process should continue to be volatile and ongoing.

AMENDMENT SUGGESTED

The one suggestion I would like to make, if you would allow me, is to urge the committee to reconsider the position offered in section 205, lines 12 to 17, which I believe you find on page 26 of the bill. Perhaps if we could modify that particular section, and instead of saying that the programs of technical and vocational education of the Washington Technical Institute are hereby determined to be sound and valid, and shall be used as the basis for a unit of the university if the insertion in line 15 after the word "and" of the phrase, "the process by which these curricula were developed shall be used as the basis," I think we would have a safer, sounder approach to curriculum development.

MEET CHANGING NEEDS

Education changes so fast that it is just impossible to say that one thing, no matter how perfect today, can be equally satisfactory tomorrow.

It is important that job oriented courses continue to respond to and to meet changing needs.

TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS

We are all aware of the national dissatisfaction with most public elementary and secondary schools. There are many reasons for this. It is my view that one of the factors involved is the general disregard for and neglect of teacher training programs.

Nationally, and especially in the District of Columbia, teacher training programs have been underfunded and taken for granted—a paradox when we espouse the great importance of elementary and secondary education.

The first 12 years of a child's education are in the hands of these teachers. For a majority of people it is the only education received. Teachers are called upon to recognize and treat emotionally disturbed children, retarded children, children with learning disabilities, as well as exceptionally gifted children—often without proper training and support.

I can think of no other profession which requires and deserves greater support. It is my utmost hope that this committee will make provisions for a strong school or college of education within the University of the District of Columbia.

Professional programs of education should be closely attuned to needs and goals of public education in this city.

Basically, education is a rejuvenating and a lifegiving process. Each generation must enrich the culture of which he is a part or the whole fabric of our society is weakened.

I hope personally that the reorganization of publicly supported higher education through the organization of the University of the District of Columbia will be followed without too much delay by measures which will improve the verticle articulation of all publicly supported education.

STRENGTHEN LINES OF COMMUNICATION

We need to work more closely, to strengthen lines of communication at various levels and in various fields of need and interest.

For far too many children in this city, public education is a cruel disappointment. The individual loss is pathetic. The group loss is incalculable. The United Negro College Fund says it well, "It is a terrible thing to waste a human mind."

REEXAMINE PROVISION

If you will, Mr. Chairman, there is one other provision in the bill that I believe should be reexamined. As I understand section 403 of H.R. 15643, the disbursement of money obtained from gifts or endowments by the public must be appropriated by Congress.

This provision I believe would certainly discourage private citizens from making gifts to the university because they would be uncertain as to whether the funds could be used and if used in the manner intended by the donor.

Finally, I am pleased that the Council's authority with respect to the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act has been retained intact.

In conclusion, the District of Columbia Council urges your committee to consider the comments made here as suggestions, certainly not criticisms, and to move expeditiously in bringing forth this legislation to create a public land-grant university in the District of Columbia.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS

Senator INOUYE. Thank you, Dr. Parker.

I am certain all of us agree that these three institutions involve the public institutions under the jurisdiction of the government of the District of Columbia.

What percentage of the students attending these three institutions are residents of the city of Washington?

Dr. PARKER. I do not have the exact figures, but it is my understanding they are better than 80-percent total, and the students who are not residents of the District of Columbia pay a nonresident differential.

Senator INOUYE. So these are institutions belonging to the people of the District of Columbia?

Dr. PARKER. That is true.

Senator INOUYE. They are not national type institutions, like Catholic University or Georgetown, where large numbers come from outside the area?

Dr. PARKER. No. They are municipal.

Senator INOUYE. And they are supported by all of the citizens of the District through their taxes?

Dr. PARKER. They are part of the appropriated budget. The only national element might be considered the fact that the board that governs Washington Technical Institute is appointed by the President. It is a national board. They are not all citizens of Washington. The Board of Higher Education appointed by the mayor are all citizens of Washington.

Senator INOUYE. I am leading up to the most crucial question facing us, and in fact the only question facing this committee as far as I am concerned.

HOME RULE

These are the institutions belonging to the people. The city of Washington is just at the eve of home rule. I would gather you are in favor of home rule?

Dr. PARKER. Yes.

Senator INOUYE. I have been told that most of the people of the city of Washington favor home rule.

Why are you at this moment requesting the Congress to make this decision?

Don't you think it should be up to the elected mayor and the elected council to make this decision?

Dr. PARKER. I do not think that this question should be postponed any longer than possible. I do not know how closely you are following the status of education in the District of Columbia—but we need a rejuvenation of education, we need to redefine goals, and we need to raise standards.

The chartering of a university has traditionally been a congressional function.

Senator INOUYE. It was a congressional function when the District of Columbia was a colony.

Dr. PARKER. But that did not relate simply to the schools of the District of Columbia.

Senator INOUYE. Would 6 months make that much of a difference?

WILL OF THE PEOPLE

Dr. PARKER. We have no guarantee that the new Council would act in 6 months. With the various activities that would be before them, I am afraid that the new Council might put other priorities before them.

Senator INOUYE. But if the new Council should decide not to merge these three institutions, will not that be an expression of the will of the people of the District?

Dr. PARKER. If the Council should decide not to merge, I would not read that as an expression of the will of the people.

TIME FACTOR

I believe that the public testimony that has already gone into the record is a pretty fair barometer of the sentiment of the people. If you will indulge me for just a minute, I think that you will see what we are talking about now is not just 6 months in the life of the Council.

We are talking about a year or 2 years in the higher education career of young people. I think that that is more important.

Senator INOUYE. The fall session has already started, has it not?

Dr. PARKER. That is true.

Senator INOUYE. So this decision will not affect the incoming class.

Dr. PARKER. The incoming class is already in place. That is very true, but the plans that have to be made, that should be going on now, say, for the schedules for the second semester, for summer school, the budget for these colleges for next year, all these are in process now, and the possibility that perhaps the new Council when it takes office after January might decide to merge, these are some of the things that are in limbo.

PREFERS ACTION BY CONGRESS

I think the best service that this Congress could do for the higher education situation in the District of Columbia would be to act.

Senator INOUYE. Dr. Parker, you are suggesting that you would prefer to rely upon the views of people coming from Hawaii, Michigan, California, to decide the future and the fate of the District of Columbia?

Dr. PARKER. I do not consider that deciding the future and fate of the District of Columbia.

The Board of Higher Education, the Board of Vocational Education, and the City Council held hearings.

We lifted the overall plan of reorganization of total education, public education in the District of Columbia; that is, what the testimony indicated, the majority of citizens saw as a pressing prime need, and this, we believe, ought to be enacted as quickly as possible.

Now, there were other items in the reorganization that we recommended should be dealt with by the new Council as it came in, which I personally felt should not have been delayed, but I believe that the psychological urge was stronger.

There was, as you know, and I am sorry I seem to be talking so much, the bill to create a Board of Regents to develop a channel of cooperation of all public education so that there would be articulation, vertical articulation and interrelationships. This is what we need.

Senator INOUYE. I am not here to quarrel with the concept of the merger itself. I bow to you as an expert in education, but I am very much puzzled that you would prefer to have Members of Congress, who are really not responsible to the people of the District, making the decisions that may affect you and your children.

Dr. PARKER. Well, if you will consider it a request from the people of the District of Columbia, that you have the power to grant, I think that that would be a very logical and reasonable way to approach it.

Senator INOUYE. You are having an election primary just a few days from now, and a few weeks after that you will decide on the first elected Mayor and City Council.

Dr. PARKER. Are you familiar with the status of the three institutions that now exist?

Senator INOUYE. Yes; I served as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia.

Dr. PARKER. I do not mean as far as the financial burden is concerned, but as you know, there are two different boards—the D.C. Teachers and Federal City are under one Board.

There were plans to merge these two by September. That merger has been delayed by a court suit brought by some members of the student government, and some members of the faculty.

There are many unsolved problems. There are many difficulties. I do not see that the Congress, the Senate taking an action that will complete a process that has been in the hamper of development over a period of years, would in any way be an affront to the home rule, as it comes next year. I really do not.

Senator INOUYE. So you are suggesting that the incoming Mayor and the Council may not consider this matter important enough for consideration, and that you wish Congress to do it?

SHOULD NOT WAIT

DR. PARKER. I do not wish to say that. I knew they consider it important, but I think that as far as the students and the citizens, and the total situation for higher education is concerned, I think that this would be an opportunity to right a very unfortunate longstanding situation, and not wait until say February, March, or April of next year at the earliest before the Council would enact such a law.

Senator INOUYE. I appreciate your testimony very much.

Your points will be taken into consideration. Thank you very much.

Dr. PARKER. Thank you.

[Dr. Parker's prepared statement follows:]

TESTIMONY OF DR. MARJORIE H. PARKER, MEMBER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CITY COUNCIL ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE A PUBLIC LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY THROUGH THE REORGANIZATION OF THE EXISTING LOCAL INSTITUTIONS OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

September 5, 1974

I am deeply appreciative of this opportunity to testify on behalf of the District of Columbia Council on proposed legislation to authorize a public land-grant university through the reorganization of the existing local institutions of public post-secondary education in the District of Columbia. The Committee should be congratulated on the expeditious manner in which public hearings have been scheduled following passage of H. R. 15643 by the House of Representatives.

The District of Columbia Council strongly supports the consolidation of public higher education. Earlier this year public hearings were held at the invitation of Congressman Charles C. Diggs, Chairman of the House District Commitee, by a Joint Committee of the Board of Higher Education, the Board of Vocational Education, and the Council's Education, Youth Affairs and Manpower Committee on a "Rough Discussion Draft to Reorganize Public Education in the District of Columbia." A majority of those who

testified supported the concept of a public university system in the District of Columbia. The results of those hearings and a revised draft bill were transmitted to the Chairman of the House District Committee as well as the Sub-Committee on Education by the Joint Committee.

My testimony today will include the remarks I made on behalf of the Council before members of the House District Sub-Committee on Education on July 1, 1974, with some additional comments on certain specifics now included in H. R. 15643.

The Council believes that a university system would provide a legal mechanism within which greater coordination, unification and equalization of public higher education could be accomplished. As an educator, a member of the District of Columbia Council, and with full Council support, I have tried to establish as public policy the position that students enrolled at publicly supported institutions of higher education deserve equal support whether they desire to study in the areas of business management, computer science, the fine arts or the teaching profession. At the present time there is a great disparity of funding between the three institutions with per student expenditures varying up to several

thousand dollars. A university of the District of Columbia seems to be the best hope for a more equitable distribution of funds and resources so as to provide equal educational opportunity with equal quality for all.

Creation of a university system should also further cohesiveness of purpose and goals with regard to higher education by maximum utilization of available public funds.

A university system as conceived in H.R. 15643 with distinct colleges and schools, including graduate programs and post-graduate programs will provide a wide range of opportunity for all residents of the District of Columbia. Students with varying abilities, but who for financial reasons cannot take advantage of the programs offered by the many fine universities in the area, will have access to a multiplicity of opportunities within the envisioned university. I feel strongly that the people of the District of Columbia have a right to look to the publicly supported university for post-secondary level education of a caliber equal to the finest privately supported institutions. To create and sustain opportunities for quality education, we must bring together all elements now being supported by tax dollars.

A democracy depends upon the sound thought and judgment of all of its people for its strength. If the poor and middle class of our society are denied quality education, if only the rich can take advantage of education offered by universities of high caliber, then democracy passes out of the hands of the general public and that is true elitism and the death knoll of a democratic state. If West Point was a private tuition institution so that only the wealthy could attend, our national military policy would be in the complete control of the rich. So too, if we cannot offer public education to all equal to that afforded by the rich, our businesses, educational institutions and governmental agencies will be in the control of our smallest minority. Ideally, the District should, through a university system, offer the kind of education which would attract children of Congressmen, Senators and Presidents as well as our other citizens.

In examining the existing public institutions of secondary education and in determining which to be sound and valid, I believe a systematic, objective process should be used and that all the institutions should be required to undergo to the same process. In this day and time nearly every aspect of higher education is

vocational, even the liberal arts. Unfortunately the time perhaps experienced in the days of Plato and Aristotle when people were able to study for the love of truth and knowledge alone is passed. Almost all professionals return to the classroom to upgrade their skills. We should not be precipitous in deciding that certain courses of study are of such a sound or indeed ideal vocational nature that we freeze ourselves into rigid programs which cannot be changed as the need arises. It is my understanding that present offerings at Washington Technical Institute have been developed on the basis of computerized extrapolations of data related to the present and future employment potential in the Washington area. Such a process should continue to be vital and on-going. I would urge the Committee to re-think the position adopted in Sec. 205, lines 12-17. It is important that job oriented courses continue to respond to and to meet changing needs.

We are all aware of the national dissatisfaction with most public elementary and secondary schools. There are many reasons for this. It is my view that one of the factors involved is the general disregard for and neglect of teacher training programs. Nationally and especially in the District of Columbia, teacher training programs have been underfunded and taken for granted -- a paradox when we espouse the great importance of elementary and secondary education. The first twelve years of a child's education are in the hands of these teachers. For a majority of people it is the only education received. Teachers are called upon to recognize and

treat emotionally disturbed children, retarded children, children with learning disabilities as well as exceptionally gifted children -- often without proper training and support. I can think of no other profession which requires and deserves greater support. It is my utmost hope that this Committee will make provisions for a strong school or college of education within the University of the District of Columbia. Professional programs of education should be closely attuned to needs and goals of public education in this city.

Basicly education is a rejuvenating and a life giving process. Each generation must enrich the culture of which he is a part or the whole fabric of our society is weakened. I hope personally that the reorganization of publicly supported higher education through the organization of the University of the District of Columbia will be followed without too much delay by measures which will improve the verticle articulation of all publicly supported education. We need to work more closely, to strengthen lines of communication at various levels and in various fields of need and interest. For far too many children in this city public education is a cruel disappointment. The individual loss is pathetic. The group loss is incalculable. The United Negro College Fund says it well, "It is a terrible thing to waste a human mind."

If you will, Mr. Chairman, there is one other provision in the bill that I believe should be re-examined. As I understand Section 403 of H. R. 15643, the disbursement of monies obtained from gifts or endowments by the public must be appropriated by Congress. This provision I believe would certainly discourage private citizens from making gifts to the university because they would be uncertain as to whether the funds could be used and if used in the manner intended by the donor.

Finally, I am pleased that the Council's authority with respect to the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act has been retained intact.

In conclusion, the District of Columbia Council urges your Committee to consider the comments made here as suggestions, certainly not criticisms, and to move expeditiously in bringing forth this legislation to create a public land grant university in the District of Columbia.

Washington, D. C.
September 5, 1974

Senator INOUYE. Our next witness is Mr. George W. Apperson of the Greater Washington Central Labor Council, and he is accompanied by Mr. Jack MacKenzie, Director of the Labor Studies Office.

Gentlemen, welcome to the committee.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE W. APPERSON, PRESIDENT, GREATER WASHINGTON CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL, ACCOMPANIED BY JOHN R. MacKENZIE, DIRECTOR, LABOR STUDIES OFFICE

Mr. APPERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity of appearing here on behalf of this legislation, which is pretty important to us.

My name is George W. Apperson, and I am the president of the Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO; and appearing with me is Mr. John R. MacKenzie, the acting chairman of the council's committee on education.

We appreciate the opportunity to give the council's view on H.R. 15643 before the Senate District Committee on behalf of some 175,000 trade union members and their families, who live and work in the District of Columbia and its suburbs.

The Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, has supported public higher education for the District of Columbia since before the turn of the century.

We worked very hard for the establishment of both the Washington Technical Institute and the Federal City College during their formative period and since their establishment by the Congress.

HOME RULE

We are supporters of the concept of a State land-grant university system for the District of Columbia. However, the Labor Council has also been a longtime supporter of home rule for the District of Columbia. We have, therefore, grave reservations about the Congress acting to establish a University for the District of Columbia on the eve of home rule. It would seem to us that this entire matter should be left to the District's about-to-be-elected Mayor and City Council.

But the House has acted, and the Senate District Committee now has H.R. 15643 before it. Therefore, the Labor Council felt it should provide this committee with its analysis of H.R. 15643 and suggested amendments. These amendments will, in our judgment, provide for a viable university system to serve the citizens of the District of Columbia, its suburbs, the various publics and institutions which make up our metropolitan area.

AMENDMENTS SUGGESTED

The council's analysis of the bill with suggested amendments has been submitted to the committee. I would like to summarize them at this time.

We favor a university system for the District of Columbia under a single board of trustees. This board should be the policymaking and budget body, and we feel the system should have an overall administrative officer called a chancellor, instead of a president.

We do not see the university as a straight-line administrative system, but made up of several schools, colleges, institutes, campuses as it develops in the future.

Therefore, we support the continuation of the Washington Technical Institute and the Federal City College, each with its own president.

Both, after all, serve different publics, have different faculty with different educational objectives, and provide graduates who are trained in quite different ways.

PROGRAMS DIFFICULT TO CHANGE

If we read H.R. 15643 correctly, the House is attempting to keep WTI intact by validating its programs. We feel this is the wrong solution, and it can be very harmful to a technical institute whose students must be kept abreast of technology or they will fail to find jobs.

Once programs are established legally, they will be very difficult to change. It would seem to us that technical change moves at a more rapid rate than does change in the liberal arts, so the proposed board of trustees should be given powers to establish program changes at WTI as well as at the other institutions.

Let us keep the Federal City College as the liberal arts institution and the Washington Technical Institute as the 2-year technical college, and let the appointed trustees make future program and institutional changes.

RESTRICTIVE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT OF TRUSTEES

We have great difficulty with the unduly restrictive residency requirement of the trustees. We feel a simple majority being residents of the District should be sufficient. This will permit the Mayor and Council to select those with greatest ability to meet the university system's needs. The House bill makes the basic assumption that all students of FCC and WTI will live in the District, now and forever.

We feel the students should elect whom they please, and that the alumni should have the same rights. But we would urge the addition of language that the trustees appointed should be broadly representative of the District to include government, labor, business, and church.

This, in our judgment, would give the major institutional groups a continuing interest in our new university and help them to provide support for it.

TRUSTEES SHOULD PROVIDE FOR EXPENDITURES

The House bill, at several places, states that the proposed board of trustees be governed by Federal expenditure requirements for per diem, travel, temporary help, and so forth, that are keyed to Federal rules.

We would urge that these be completely removed and the power be granted to the trustees to provide for such expenditures.

We would urge removal of the word "three" from page 8, line 11, of the House bill. The word "three" seems to guarantee the legal existence of the District of Columbia Teachers College until some future time.

As we understand it, the District of Columbia Teachers College and the Federal City College are in the process of merger. If this is held up, as we understand it, there will be serious administrative problems for both institutions: legally, administratively, and budgetarily.

We also have difficulty with the House proposal that gives the trustees the power to evaluate, establish, and accredit and then says they can only reprogram $50,000.

This means they can move 2½ professors and one secretary. We would urge that this amount be raised to $300,000. This amount is small but is more realistic in terms of the combined budgets of the existing institutions which is over $30 million.

Under the duties of trustees: We feel the trustees should be given the option to obtain goods as well as services outside of the governmental system—section (e), page 10, does not permit this.

The government procurement system is too slow and just cannot deliver such items as books on time. Yet this can be done at all other area universities. We would recommend the trustees be given the option to use or not use the government procurement system.

SALARIES

Again under duties of trustees, page 11 (i), we want to be sure that the trustees have the power to determine all faculty and staff salaries for the university and all of its units. There has been no wage increase granted in the last 3 years to the present colleges and institutes with the exception of a very small 5.2 percent increase that is scheduled for this year.

MUST COMPETE FOR FACULTY

This, we feel, is not sufficient, and the District system of determining wages for the college has not kept up with the cost of living, let alone provide increases for the system itself which must compete for faculty with other State land-grant college systems.

Senior level people just will not come to Washington from the State universities unless they can receive what they now obtain in their own State universities. FCC is losing out competitively.

This will have a disastrous effect on the new university unless it is able to compete in the academic national market.

AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH A FOUNDATION

Further, we would recommend that the trustees be granted authority to establish a foundation within the tax laws that will permit the university to accept gifts, donations, scholarship funds, et cetera, which is free of U.S. Government expenditure requirements.

As we read this House bill, there is no provision for a foundation, and we feel a university would need one.

Unless this authority is granted to the trustees, it is doubtful if donors—public, private, or foundation—will provide educational and research funds if government expenditure rules are going to apply. Without the foundation, the taxpayer will be asked to pick up funds that private donors could and would provide.

RESIDENCY

We would also advocate the removal of the word "residency" from page 12, line 8, from the list of items on which the personnel system would be permitted to establish policy.

We feel residency has no place in a college or university system. Scholarship and academic accomplishment should be the sole criteria on which a person is hired.

GUARANTEE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

We would advocate removal of the reference to the D.C. Personnel Manual and chapter 25. We feel a clear statement guaranteeing collective bargaining rights to all academic and nonacademic employees by the trustees is superior to involving the university in the District of Columbia personnel system.

We further recommend that the word "labor" be added after the word "educational" and before the word "business" on page 17, line 24, to the list of institutional groups that can sit on advisory committees.

In closing, I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the committee for the opportunity to present the Labor Council's view on H.R. 15643.

Thank you.

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much.

WHO SHOULD MAKE THE DETERMINATION

Do you prefer the Members of Congress make the determination, or the elected mayor and elected council exercise the will of the people and make this determination?

Mr. APPERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think in the statement I just read, it states that we would prefer that the city council and newly elected mayor do this.

However, the Congress has already moved on this legislation, and, therefore, we are appearing before you on this matter.

PASS OR FILE

Senator INOUYE. Do you prefer to have this half of the Congress act, or file the bill?

Mr. APPERSON. File the bill.

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much.

Mr. APPERSON. Thank you.

Senator INOUYE. Our next witness is Mr. Richard K. Fox, Jr., vice chairman of the District of Columbia Board of Higher Education.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD K. FOX, JR., VICE CHAIRMAN, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. FOX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The District of Columbia Board of Higher Education would like to express its appreciation to the Senate District Committee for providing an opportunity to testify at this hearing. We commend the committee on its continued interest in public higher education in the District of Columbia.

With few exceptions, the Board of Higher Education warmly supports the establishment of the University of the District of Columbia provided by H.R. 15643.

AMENDMENTS SUGGESTED

The Board proposed that the Senate District Committee consider the following changes in the language of the bill:

ALL PROGRAMS SHOULD BE REVIEWED

1. Section 205(a) (lines 12–17) exempts the program of the Washington Technical Institute from review by the board of trustees.

The Board believes that a thorough review should be conducted of all programs in the three existing public institutions—Federal City College, the District of Columbia Teachers College, and the Washington Technical Institute—to determine which program should be included in the new University of the District of Columbia.

Our opposition to this section as presently worded is not based on objection to the curriculums at the Washington Technical Institute, but on our belief that each program should be examined carefully to insure educational quality in the institution as a whole.

It automatically blankets a particular curriculum into the overall program of the university, and to establish in the procedure which we would hope would not be contingent, therefore, Mr. Chairman, we would propose that section 205(a) terminate with the phrase "post-graduate programs" on line 12, page 26, and that the final word of line 12 plus lines 13 through 17 be deleted.

SHOULD NOT BE ENCUMBERED WITH PERSONAL SYSTEM PROCEDURES

2. Section 201(a), page 21 (lines 18–20) establishes the University of the District of Columbia as an independent agency of the District of Columbia Government.

Procedural and administrative regulations of agencies of the District of Columbia government seriously hamper the normal functions of an institution of higher education, particularly in recruiting and retaining qualified faculty.

The draft of this bill submitted by the Joint Committee of the Board of Higher Education, the Board of Vocational Education, and the City Council Education Committee included language which stated "that the provisions of section 742 of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act shall not be applicable to the University of the District of Columbia."

We believe it is contradictory to give the Board of Trustees power to establish a personnel system and at the same time designate the university as an agency of the District of Columbia thereby encumbering the university with the procedures of the District personnel system.

Hence, we urge the deletion of any reference to the University of the District of Columbia as an agency of the District government and that the foregoing language be substituted.

UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT SHOULD NOT BE AN OFFICER OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES

3. Section 201(j), page 24 (lines 15–17) establishes that the president of the university shall be an ex-officio member of Trustees and shall serve as secretary to the Trustees.

A statement on the relationship of the president to the Board of Trustees issued by the Middle States Association, which is the regional accrediting commission, states that the Trustees' duties "are closely related to those of the president and his administrative staff and to those of the faculty, but distinct from them."

By designating the president as an officer of the Board, the bill interferes in our judgment with the check and balance system which should operate between the board and the president. We urge the deletion of the words "and shall serve as secretary to the Trustees."

FUNDS SHOULD BE AVAILABLE WITHOUT NECESSITY OF APPROPRIATION

4. Section 205(h), page 28, (lines 7–8) provides that fees paid by resident and nonresident students will be deposited in a revolving fund and shall be available when appropriated for such purposes as the Trustees shall approve.

This is somewhat unfair to us, but we assume this means with the action of the Congress.

We urge that the funds be available to the university without the necessity of an appropriation and therefore recommend that the language "when appropriated" be removed.

STATE CONSENT

5. Section 209, page 32, line 25, stated that the enactment of this act shall be deemed to satisfy any requirement of State consent contained in section 209.

This is an obvious error. I think it is a typographical error.

Line 25 should read "provisions of the law referred to in section 208." This reference to State consent relates to the establishment of the university as a land-grant institution and should refer to the previous section not to itself.

FUND FOR UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

6. Section 301(b), page 34 (line 7) provides a $2,000 fund for the president. An amendment in the House of Representatives reduced this amount from $25,000 to $2,000.

We believe the president ought to have greater discretion in the use of funds, and to limit the president to $2,000 is not adequate.

We urge the Senate District Committee to recommend restoration of all or a substantial portion of this fund.

GIFTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

7. Section 403, page 35 (lines 4–8) provides that gifts and contributions to the University are available when appropriated.

If this phrase requires action by the Congress, we strongly urge its deletion. Inclusion would severely curtail gifts and contributions from private sources. Certainly private contributors to the university should be able to donate funds for specific projects without Congressional decision on the use of these funds.

ABOLISHMENT OF BOARDS

8. Section 207, page 31 (lines 4–8) provides that the Board of Higher Education and the Board of Vocational Education be abolished on the day the Trustees announce that the consolidation of the existing public institutions has been effectuated, but no later than June 30, 1976.

The Board of Higher Education is concerned with the difficulties which may arise from simultaneous planning by three boards, and we urge the following amendment to section 207: "The Board of Higher Education and the Board of Vocational Education shall be abolished on the day the trustees hold their first meeting." This would take out of existance the old Board of Higher Education, and transfer complete responsibility to the newly appointed Board of Trustees.

These are the proposed changes we would make. We would urge for consideration in the bill these changes, Mr. Chairman.

I have nothing else to add.

CONGRESSIONAL INTERVENTION

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much, Mr. Fox.

The first two witnesses this morning have indicated a lack of unanimity here. You have suggested many changes. You have expressed a fear of congressional intervention.

Do you believe that we should make that decision, or would you prefer to have your elected representatives make this decision?

Mr. FOX. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that I expressed a fear of congressional intervention.

I was concerned about the question of realizing the appropriation will have to come from the Congress. It is the unclearness of when and how the Congress will act or make available certain funds. That is the only question we have on the action of the Congress.

WHO SHOULD ENACT LEGISLATION

To get to the other question of when and how this bill should be enacted, let me just say that we believe that the public hearings that were held earlier this year and last year, which ran over two Saturdays, and which included probably more than 40 to 50 witnesses, all testified to the need, and to a broad community support for the concept of a university in the District of Columbia.

I think that is well established that the community by and large warmly supports the idea of a university. The question of who should enact this legislation is one that I think is a secondary issue, because we do have broad and comprehensive support of the concept of the university.

I do not see any difference. I do not know it would make any particular difference if the bill were to be enacted by the Congress, or if it were to be enacted by the newly established City Council.

I think that this particular bill that is under consideration, if it is delayed and passed over to the City Council, I would hope it would be passed in its entirety with some suggested changes.

If it is passed by the Congress, I would hope it would be passed as it presently stands with these proposed amendments that we suggest; so I think that is a secondary issue.

Senator INOUYE. If it passed without your suggestions, how would you feel?

Mr. FOX. We would accept the legislation. We so strongly believe in the idea of a university for the District of Columbia, that we would accept the legislation, and we would be happy to have it.

ALLOWS FOR CITY COUNCIL AMENDMENTS

I think there is also provision in the legislation as it presently stands which allows for amendments to be enacted by the newly established City Council, so that conceivably, if there were the need, the demonstrated need for some change in the legislation at some future point, this could be placed before the newly established City Council, and could be considered by them.

WILLINGNESS TO WAIT

Senator INOUYE. You are not willing to wait 6 months to have the people's representatives make the decision?

Mr. FOX. I do not know that it is a question of 6 months, Mr. Chairman.

I think it is a question of some months, and how many months is hard to say.

It is not a matter of now long we are willing to wait. I think we are willing to wait until we can get a good bill. This is a good bill, and we would like to see the bill considered and enacted as quickly as possible.

WILL OF THE PEOPLE

Senator INOUYE. If this is supported by the majority of the people of the District; do you not believe the City Council will pass a similar ordinance?

Mr. FOX. I would have reason to believe so, Mr. Chairman, yes.

Senator INOUYE. But you would prefer to have non-District residents make this decision?

Mr. FOX. I would prefer, Mr. Chairman, to see the bill considered and passed as quickly as can be done, and I think again, because the community has considered this bill, has contributed to the reformulation of the bill, that we now have before us, I think the will of the community has been expressed.

HOME RULE

Senator INOUYE. When the hearings were held, you did not have home rule?

Mr. FOX. No; but we had home rule on the horizon. We had some confidence that home rule would become available to us.

Senator INOUYE. I thank you very much, Mr. Fox.

Mr. FOX. Thank you.

Senator INOUYE. Our next witness is Mr. Charles I. Cassell, president of OPEN (Organization for Political Equality Now).

STATEMENT OF CHARLES I. CASSELL, PRESIDENT, OPEN (ORGANIZATION FOR POLITICAL EQUALITY NOW)

BILL IS UNTIMELY

Mr. CASSELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I came here to persuade this committee that this bill was not only untimely, but that in concept, the idea of Congress, on the very eve of electing our own government, this concept is wrong, and my observations indicate perhaps it is unnecessary to be very persuasive in that respect to this committee.

However, I would like my remarks recorded, as to what I think is a reflection of the community in general.

Senator INOUYE. Without objection, your prepared statement will be made a part of the record in full, or you may read it.

Mr. CASSELL. I would like to read my statement.

Senator INOUYE. Please do.

Mr. CASSELL. Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the U.S. Senate:

My name is Charles I. Cassell, President of OPEN [Organization for Political Equality Now, Inc.], and a former member of the elected District of Columbia Board of Education.

OPEN is an organization whose objective is to develop a mass peoples' movement for full political freedom for our city.

Once again, you are considering legislation for Washington, D.C., which originated in the House District Committee on the very eve of our city government election.

PROPER FUNCTION OF LOCAL ELECTED LEGISLATORS

It is the proper function of the government we will elect to legislate for the education of its constituents, not of the U.S. Congress over whom we have no influence at the polls.

Last year the same House District Committee proposed to create a Board of Regents, of which our elected School Board would have been, in effect, a subcommittee.

At a public hearing held in the District Building earlier this year, more than 90 percent of the District of Columbia citizens testifying opposed an appointed Board of Regents.

The District of Columbia School Board, on my motion, strongly opposed the idea and refused even to participate in the hearing.

One of the major reasons, strongly stated, for the overwhelming opposition to the Board of Regents proposal was the impropriety of Congress intruding on the proper authority of the city government we are about to elect.

I would hope that the House District Committee's subsequent withdrawal of its proposed legislation was in response to the expressed will of the people.

PUBLIC UNIVERSITY MANDATED BY U.S. CONGRESS NOT MENTIONED

I would like to say at that hearing it has been said there was strong support on the part of the people testifying for a public university, the idea of one mandated by the U.S. Congress was not even mentioned.

I was at those hearings, and the idea was only touched upon lightly. The issue there was the Board of Regents, and there was a subsequent question, do you support the idea of a public university, but there was no expression of desire on the part of the people of the District of Columbia for Congress to mandate such a university.

It is, therefore, difficult to understand why that same committee has again brought to you legislation for the District of Columbia in the area of education now that we are even closer to the date that our elected government will take office.

WHAT IS THE URGENCY?

What is the urgency that causes this disrespect for the Home Rule Act passed by the Congress last year?

Why this usurpation in advance of the new government's authority before it takes office?

Is this a sample of the coming relationship between the elected District of Columbia government and the Congress?

Where is the citizen participation that must be a part of any such sweeping change in our educational system?

Why were there no public hearings in the communities before sudden congressional hearing?

CIRCUMVENTING LOCAL ELECTED GOVERNMENT

Does this committee contend that because many District of Columbia citizens believe that a public university is desirable they want big brother on Capitol Hill to mandate one, circumventing their elected government over which they have some control?

Does not each of you gentlemen, a political representative of your State, treasure the protection afforded by your State government against the very kind of Federal control that this proposed legislation represents for Washington, D.C.?

Although we in Washington, D.C., have been denied the protection against Federal domination afforded by statehood, we still demand freedom from Federal control of local public education, and we insist that local decisions be made by those we elect just as do your various constituents.

It is a certainty that the citizens of St. Louis, Mo., for example, would never accept reorganization of St. Louis schools by the U.S. Congress.

In the past the rejoinder has been . . . "But the Congress has the power to do to Washington, D.C., what it does not have the power to do to St. Louis."

And that, gentlemen, is the point. Not only do you exercise such power now, over citizens who do not vote for you, but you will continue to exercise such power under home rule next year.

And this is one of the very serious shortcomings of the Home Rule Act of 1973 that OPEN has been highlighting.

Now, while our purpose is to develop an effective citizens' movement to bring about a major amendment of the Home Rule Act, we must, at this point appeal to the ethics, the logic and the democratic sensitivities of the members of this committee urge, the cessation of congressional interference in the local affairs of our city.

The rationale for the reorganization of public education in Washington, D.C., by the Congress is as weak and unpersuasive as was the rationale for the now-defunct Board of Regents and Eisenhower Convention Center bills.

Over the years I have testified scores of times before both Houses of Congress. Only on rare occasions have committee members shown empathy and respect for the opinions and desires of District of Columbia citizens who do not vote for them.

More often the attitude has been that Congress will examine the facts as it sees them and then make judgments disregarding the interests of the people affected by those judgments.

We citizens in the Nation's Capital are afforded only the opportunity of contact with those who make our laws, as we are at this hearing, but have no influence on you since you never face us at the polls.

If after this hearing the Senate District Committee supports the House bill we can only assume that this committee has joined the House in its determination to beat the soon-to-be-elected city government to the punch, because it knows that officials elected by the people would draft an entirely different bill than the one handed to us by the House District Committee.

UNACCEPTABLE SECTIONS OF THE BILL

Here are some of the unacceptable sections of the bill which undoubtedly would be changed by our elected local government, possibly as follows:

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Board of Trustees, in the committee bill, consists of 15 persons, 12 appointed by the Mayor, only 1, I repeat, only 1 of which is a student from one of the existing institutions of higher learning.

And surprise of surprises, 2 of the 12 mayoral appointees may be nonresidents of the District of Columbia, "if in the Mayor's judgment such nominations would enhance the trustees."

Thus, the bill foresees the probability that the Mayor may not be able to identify 1 student and 11 District of Columbia residents whose nominations would enhance the trustees. The three remaining trustees would be appointed by the three alumni associations.

Now, the elected city government, after public hearings, would more than likely come up with a board of trustees composed thusly:

Nine members, three students, one from each of the three colleges, three alumni members having graduated no longer than 5 years ago, and three community persons.

Furthermore, the alumni and community people would probably be elected by the community at large, and the students would be elected by the students.

This kind of representation would be likely because the framers of the legislation would have been recently elected by people from those three groups. As I said before, the Congress enjoys no such advice and influence from its subjects as is evident in the nonrepresentative composition of the trustee board in the bill before you.

ANNUAL REPORT

The committee bill has the board of trustees making an annual report to the Congress, the City Council, the Mayor, and to the general public.

The elected government would probably not propose reporting to the Congress, just as the elected City Council of St. Louis would not think of reporting to the U.S. Congress regarding the operation of their public schools.

LOCAL ELECTED GOVERNMENT SHOULD PLAY ITS LEGITIMATE ROLE

Gentlemen of the Senate District Committee, as a former elected public servant in this colonial city, I implore you to think of District of Columbia citizens with the same respect and concern as you do for your constituents.

I implore you to be sensitive to and apprehensive about the fact that you exercise extraordinary legislative control over the lives of 800,000 American citizens who can never cast a ballot in your elections.

To be unmindful of this dilemma will result in shameless exploitation of a people's political powerlessness here in our Nation's Capital. To pursue this bill is to callously ignore your commitment to representative government and equal protection of the laws.

To support this bill is to take unconscionable advantage of a loophole in or misinterpretation of the U.S. Constitution by which the U.S. Congress, having legislative authority over the National Seat of Government, oversteps such legislative authority and deprives District of Columbia citizens of their basic constitutional rights to representative government.

AGAINST BILL

We, in the Organization for Political Equality Now, believe that you have no choice but to allow our elected government to play its legitimate role in legislating for public education in Washington, D.C.

Therefore, we strongly urge that the Senate District Committee not vote this bill out.

APPROPRIATENESS OF REMARKS

I would say again that any of these remarks which would in any way reflect adversely on the decision that this committee might make, certainly are inappropriate at this time based on the testimony and the questions I have heard up to now, sir.

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much, Mr. Cassell. I would like to apologize to all of the witnesses if I have just concentrated on one aspect of this problem—the aspect of self-government.

As some of you are aware, it was only 15 years ago that Hawaii became a State, and so many of us in Hawaii are sensitive about self-government as yet, and for the life of me, I cannot quite understand how on the eve of self-government and home rule, there are some in the District of Columbia who would prefer to have outsiders make decisions for them.

Thank you very much.

Mr. CASSELL. Thank you.

Senator INOUYE. Our next witness is Dr. William D. Mandle, president of the District of Columbia Teachers College Faculty Federation, local 2251 AFT (AFL–CIO).

STATEMENT OF DR. WILLIAM D. MANDLE, PRESIDENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS COLLEGE FACULTY FEDERATION, LOCAL 2251, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS (AFL–CIO)

Dr. MANDLE. Good morning and thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

In listening to the testimony this morning, to the various witnesses, and to your remarks, I hope I can answer some of the questions that you have posed.

I have revised my written testimony, so I would like to have my oral testimony next.

Senator INOUYE. Go ahead.

Dr. MANDLE. First of all, I would like to say that I was a resident of New York State, New Jersey, Ohio, and Indiana before moving to the District.

I had always thought of our Nation's Capital as a showplace for the country. I have had my eyes opened since I have lived in the District.

NEED FOR URGENCY

In answer to your question, posed to a couple of witnesses, as to why we should be in a hurry, I have several answers to that.

First of all, the Senate has and will continue to pass legislation affecting the education of students throughout all 50 States.

The proximity of the Senate to the District should not cause the District to be singled out for a deprivation of support.

When you ask, what is the hurry, why can't you wait for 6 months, I was so pleased to see the board of trustees membership to include faculty, student alumni representation.

I deplore the past inadequate funding for existing Teachers College, where the faculty of over 100 professionals deserve more than one full-time secretary.

There has been no cost-of-living adjustment since I joined the faculty in the fall of 1972, when I first moved to the Washington area.

We need a board of trustees which will champion faculty as well as student needs. You ask, what is the rush?

TEACHERS COLLEGE WILL GO OUT OF EXISTENCE

As I see it, if the bill does not pass in some form, the District of Columbia Teachers College, 123-year-old institution, will go out of existence, and so will the chapter of the American Federation of Teachers which I represent.

Senator INOUYE. Are you suggesting that if the bill does not pass this year, the Teachers College will go out of existence?

Dr. MANDLE. Yes, and at about the same time in January, if the Board of Higher Education does not merge our institution with Federal City College, if that does not happen, I believe that our chapter will go out of existence.

We do represent our chapter, which represents the faculty of the District of Columbia Teachers College.

We have cards signed by over two-thirds of the faculty, designating our chapter as the bargaining agent between the college, Teachers College, and the Board.

Senator INOUYE. You are saying that your faculty chapter will go out of existence, not the institute itself?

Dr. MANDLE. If there is a merger taking place, and I very much respect Mr. Fox's remarks before including the District of Columbia Teachers College as one of the three existing institutions, but the gentleman from the labor council did not mention the District of Columbia Teachers College.

MERGING

There is, as you know, and has been an attempt to not consolidate, but to abolish the District of Columbia Teachers College, by merging it with the Federal City College.

We are concerned with due process, that these policies would carry over into an institution.

We are willing to give up the autonomy we have with the creation of the District of Columbia University. We are fearful of what happens in the interim.

Senator INOUYE. You have a suit in the courts?

Dr. MANDLE. We do not have a suit. We are the faculty federation. The students have a suit which have restrained the Board.

One can see in the second semester it would be possible for the Board of Higher Education, perhaps to merge the two institutions, and as such, our faculty organization would go out of existence.

As the recent president, I think I have to protect our existence. There were two other items I wished to mention.

I am happy to hear the suggestion of Mr. Fox, he put a period after the sentence excluding Washington Technical Institute.

I have prepared an extra clause to cover the District of Columbia Teachers College, which includes a broad base of general education requirements to fortify teacher training courses, which has been accredited and effective for many years.

GLAD TO RELY ON JUDGMENT OF LOCAL REPRESENTATIVES

We would be glad to rely on the judgment of the representatives of the new District government. We would be glad to rely on them. We are fearful that the priority given to a university of the District of Columbia might jeopardize the existence of the teachers council, and we would hope for adequate funding in this interim to make up for the losses which we have suffered through Congress up to this time. Thank you.

CAMPAIGN PLEDGES

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much. I have been following the election campaign as closely as I can, and I gather that most or all of the candidates for Mayor and the City Council, have pledged themselves to provide the finest institutions of higher education for the people of the District of Columbia, and they have made that a matter of high priority.

Do you believe that after elected, they will forget this promise?

Dr. MANDLE. I have no insurance. I do not know. I would hope that they would go ahead.

WILL OF THE PEOPLE

Senator INOUYE. But you have greater faith in the Congress of the United States?

Dr. MANDLE. I believe that it is right for the people of the District to determine what their education should be.

I would hope at the very least that this bill would become a blueprint for at least the outer design of a university to come.

PASS OR FILE

Senator INOUYE. Finally, so we have this in the record, do you prefer to have the Congress pass this measure, or do you prefer to have the Congress file this measure?

Dr. MANDLE. Lacking a guarantee that the District would make this a high-priority item, I would have to say I would prefer the Senate pass this.

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much.

Your prepared statement will be a part of the record.

Dr. MANDLE. Thank you.

[Dr. Mandle's prepared statement follows:]

TESTIMONY AT THE HEARINGS ON THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
HELD BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE
ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING
SEPTEMBER 5, 1974 AT 10:00 A.M.
BY
WILLIAM DEE MANDLE
PRESIDENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS COLLEGE FACULTY FEDERATION
LOCAL 2251, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS (AFL-CIO)

I wish to state that I have been in favor of and remain in favor of the establishment of a University of the District of Columbia with the continued existence of the District of Columbia Teachers College as a pre-condition of that establishment.

In support of that position, I ask that the wording of the Bill be revised in the proper section:

> Programs will be reviewed and revised except for the program at Washington Technical Institute which is vocational in nature and which has proven itself to be viable and effective; and except for the program of studies at the District of Columbia Teachers College which includes a broad base of general education requirements to fortify teacher training courses which have been both effective and accredited for many years.

I am pleased to see the inclusion of the District guidelines for labor-management relations (Chapter 25-A of the District Personnel Manual). I would urge that the same section of the Bill include the following revision:

> Faculty-developed policies now existing at the three constituent institutions should remain binding; these include, but are not limited to, policies on appointment, reappointment, due process, leave, promotion, etc.

I am pleased to see the Board of Trustees membership broadened to include faculty and student representation. I deplore the present and past lack of adequate funding for the existing Teachers College. A faculty of over one hundred professionals deserves more than one full-time secretary. There has been no cost-of-living adjustment since I joined the faculty in the Fall of 1972. We need a Board of Trustees which will champion faculty as well as student needs.

William Dee Mandle

Dr. William Dee Mandle
Associate Professor of Music
District of Columbia Teachers College

Senator INOUYE. We have in the committee room a representative of the corporation counsel, Mr. Louis P. Robbins.

PENDING COURT SUIT

I would like to call upon him at this moment to explain to the committee the matter of the court suit pending at the present time.

STATEMENT OF LOUIS P. ROBBINS, ASSISTANT CORPORATION COUNSEL

Mr. ROBBINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Louis P. Robbins, assistant corporation counsel.

The suit was filed in July seeking both preliminary and a permanent injunction against the merger of Federal City College and District of Columbia Teachers College.

The grounds of the lawsuit are three:

(1) The Board of Higher Education did not have the authority to implement and put into effect a merger.

(2) That the merger was a violation of the memorandum of understanding entered into with the District of Columbia Teachers College pursuant to the provisions of the higher education bill which came under the control of the Board of Higher Education, where previously it had been under the control of the Board of Education.

(3) The third issue is what the court ruled on, was that there had not been the proper procedures under the District of Columbia Administrative Procedures Act. They had not been followed.

The court answer came down last month, a rather detailed memorandum pending. Specifically it refused to give a final decision on the merits, but only ruling on the preliminary injunction.

The court stated that the question of the authority of the Board had not been properly raised, and it would not be fair to say it sidestepped that, the court stated this is a question that will have to be taken under a challenge of jurisdiction under the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, so it dismissed that element of the complaint of allegations on the basis that the superior court did not have jurisdiction to entertain that matter.

It stated that it would not go into the memorandum of understanding on its face. It did not appear to be a well pleaded article.

Then came the Administrative Procedure Act question. The court recognized that notices had been published, although published a little late, and a hearing was scheduled for August 9, but stated this is insufficient, and before any action could be taken, that the Board of Higher Education would have to publish a detailed plan.

I do not know if it meant all of the i's had to be dotted, and all of t's had to be crossed, but what would have to be published would be the details of a proposed merger. So this all concerned both the students, faculty, and other employees of both institutions, as well as the general public, so they would know exactly what was entailed, and that it could not be just a notice of merger, to come in and to comment on it.

What would happen to tenure, what would happen to the tuition, what courses would be dropped, in short a comprehensive plan for the merger, and at that time, if that were published, and then a public

hearing was held, then the Board could proceed, leaving aside of course the jurisdictional question, the question of the Board's authority in the first place, which would be decided at a later date, and it is my understanding as of this time, I might add, upon recommendation, the granting of the preliminary injunction was not appealed.

The court said that steps toward merger could still be taken, as long as they were duly approved.

We take that to mean either through proper action of the District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act, or of course approval by way of congressional legislation, or at a later date legislation that is appropriate by the newly elected government.

It is my understanding at this time that the Board is continuing with its planning, and I would expect that sometime it will follow the detailed plan will be published, and that they will hold hearings.

BOARD OF EDUCATION TIMETABLE

Senator INOUYE. What is the timetable for the Board of Education?

Mr. ROBBINS. The last thing I heard, sir, and I do not want to be held to this, I think it would be sometime after November.

Senator INOUYE. After the elections?

Mr. ROBBINS. I believe so. As a matter of fact, I discussed this with the Chairman of the Board last evening, and she said they could not right now give a firm date as to whether they would have a plan detailed sufficiently to meet the court order to be published, but that they are working on it.

APPROVAL BY NEWLY ELECTED CITY COUNCIL

Senator INOUYE. The reaction of the Board of Education will be subject to approval by the newly elected city council, or the mayor?

Mr. ROBBINS. No, sir. I do not believe so. I have not examined the question, but the new city council would be able to pass legislation affecting it, but as of the moment, they have control of the two institutions, and unless they were changed in their basic legislation, either by the Congress, or by the newly elected city council, the same would attain after January as it does now.

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much.

Mr. ROBBINS. Thank you.

Senator INOUYE. The next witness is Mr. Marion Barry, Jr., former president of the District of Columbia Board of Education.

STATEMENT OF MARION BARRY, JR., FORMER PRESIDENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. BARRY. I would like to deviate a little bit from the prepared statement.

I have been listening to some of the comments. My name is Marion Barry, former president of the District of Columbia Board of Education. I live in the District of Columbia, and I also happen to be a candidate-at-large for the District of Columbia City Council.

I appreciate the interest that has been expressed by the House of Representatives in postsecondary education in the District of Columbia.

EDUCATION IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

It is especially gratifying that recognition is given to the fact that: "* * * the District, both in terms of total numbers and percentages, educate, at public expense, fewer of its residents, in a lesser number of courses of study, than does any State in the union and any city of comparable size."

Furthermore, the chairman of the House District Committee continues: "In terms of total appropriations for the operation of institutions of public higher education as a percentage of the States' total revenues, the range is from a high of 37 percent to a low of about 4 percent. The national average is about 12 percent. The District ranks 51st, the lowest, appropriating only 3.9 percent of its total budget for fiscal 1975 in operating expenses for postsecondary education. This is a serious indictment." [1]

I agree wholeheartedly that the facts stated above indeed constitute an outrageous indictment. However, the legislation before this committee today, H.R. 15643, only tangentially addresses the problems enumerated while it boldly and frontally attacks self-government.

NO DETAILED DISCUSSION BY WASHINGTON COMMUNITY

Since the question of this legislation came up since the public hearings, I happened to be on the Board of Education at the time the regency bill was considered, and the Board of Education agreed not to participate in those hearings, because we felt that was a matter to be considered by the newly elected government, and to my knowledge, and we had the reports there, there was no detailed discussion of H.R. 15643 by the community at that time.

Those who have said there has been detailed discussion by the Washington community of this bill are in error, and, secondly, the only discussion I recall is the general knowledge we ought to consolidate, and we ought to have a University of the District of Columbia.

The form was not discussed, I would hope that the committee would not have that impression that that happened, and it did not happen.

MATTER FOR AN ELECTED LOCAL GOVERNMENT

I will not attempt to argue for or against the merits or substance of this legislation. This is a matter, as far as I am concerned, for an elected local government and its people to debate and decide.

It seems to me that if we start now, less than 4 months before the government takes place, continue in the same trend with the Congress of the United States enacting legislation, we are going to discourage people from believing that we are serious about self-government.

SHOULD NOT BE PASSED AT THIS TIME

My argument is a simple one. No legislation should be passed at this time. The argument is also very fundamental, for to pass major nonemergency legislation at this time makes mockery of the recently enacted home rule legislation.

[1] From the Congressional Record—House, vol. 120, No. 112, July 29, 1974, p. H7234.

Why should the citizens of the District take the upcoming elections seriously if the Congress, beforehand, demonstrates that it intends to continue to run local affairs.

I urge this committee to recognize that this bill deals with a local issue and action on it usurps the authority and legitimacy of both the Home Rule Act and the new city government to be elected in 2 months.

I urge that no action be taken on this legislation.

I say this from a long issue of involvement in this city, and in the most recent 3 years of being involved with the public schools.

Thank you very much.

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much, Mr. Barry.

Mr. BARRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator INOUYE. We will now hear from a panel of witnesses from the Federal City College.

They are: Dr. Wendell Russell, president, Federal City College and District of Columbia Teachers College; Dr. Beverly Cassara, dean of graduate school, Federal City College; Dr. Ronald Williams, provost; and Dr. Joseph Brent, faculty member.

STATEMENTS OF DR. WENDELL RUSSELL, PRESIDENT, FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS COLLEGE; DR. BEVERLY CASSARA, DEAN OF GRADUATE SCHOOL, FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE; DR. RONALD WILLIAMS, PROVOST; AND DR. JOSEPH BRENT, FACULTY MEMBER

Dr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, we thank you for this opportunity.

We are sensitive to the time constraints, and we believe that Professor Brent has a most important presentation, and we ask him to proceed, and we will make the concluding remarks after.

Senator INOUYE. Please proceed.

RECAPITULATES IMPORTANT ERRORS MADE BY PUBLIC EDUCATION

Dr. BRENT. I believe that H.R. 15643, District of Columbia Public Post-Secondary Education Reorganization Act, recapitulates some of the most important errors made by public higher education in the 112 years since the passage of the Morrill Land Grant College Act of 1862.

Among these errors are its attempt to legislate curriculum; haphazard lumping together of two essentially different forms of learning—training and education—thereby jeopardizing both; its assumption that a university can somehow be created by adding the word "university" to a name; its presumption that only one population, in this case black and poor, is to be served by the institution; and, obvious to anyone who has been part of the difficulties of higher education over the past two decades, the presumption that no genuine knowledge of higher education is required to write a bill establishing a university.

MORRILL LAND GRANT COLLEGE ACT

My testimony today as an expert witness touches on all of these matters from the vantage of the professional historian. I will begin with a quotation from a letter of July 16, 1974, which is part of the legislative history of the bill.

The letter makes a claim which is of sufficient importance to examine closely, since it seems to have influenced the votes of at least one influential Congressman.

That letter claims to draw a precise inference: "In the true spirit and intent of the 1862 legislation [the Morrill Land Grant College Act] with its amendments extending land grant privileges to the District of Columbia in 1968 and 1971, the provisions of H.R. 15643 would have at its core the curricular offerings of the Washington Technical Institute whose program is vocational in objective and technical in content."

The first question to resolve is whether a university with a core curricular offering which is vocational and technical is actually in the true spirit and intent of the 1862 legislation.

The act states as its purpose that, "the leading object shall be, without excluding classical or scientific studies, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agricultural and mechanical arts."

In explaining his purpose to Congress, Representative Justin Smith Morrill of Vermont said he wished to "promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial (working class) in the several pursuits and professions of life."

Prior to the expansion of the original land grant act in 1890 which established separate but equal facilities and regular funds for the land grant institutions, Morrill attempted to correct what he believed to be a misunderstanding of intent.

"It is a mistake to suppose it was intended that every student would become either a farmer or mechanic." He went on to say that land-grant colleges would provide, "such instruction as any person might need."

Nowhere did the Congressman specify that a land-grant college "would have at its core the curricular offerings * * * whose program is vocational in objective and technical in content."

Representative Morrill did not have in mind that "the industrial class" should receive merely vocational training appropriate to their place in society, but a general education having a distinctively practical element which would assist them in bettering that place, by giving them a broad spectrum of possibilities for higher education.

HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

A second question to be resolved is whether the claim made by the letter of July 16 is supported in the history of the development of land-grant colleges and universities over the years since 1862.

The U.S. Commissioner of Education, Isaac Newton, 10 years after the Morrill Act became law, held that, "These colleges are not to be agricultural only. The sons of our farmers are not less ambitious of distinction than others, and an education that regards them as farmers only cannot meet their approbation. The purpose of an education is to teach men to observe and to think * * * . All pursuits * * * may have a common course of instruction."

However, and typical of the view of the opposition to the opinions of Morrill and Newton is the following from an agricultural newspaper in 1873: "Instead of instructing the student of agriculture to a laboratory and chemical and philosophical apparatus, we would introduce him to a pair of heavy neat's leather boots and corduroy pants, and learn him how to load manure."

The spirit of this view of the land-grant college is close to that expressed in the letter of July 16—"the capability * * * to prepare the citizenry to build roads, construct, rehabilitate and maintain housing; to distribute and regulate electrical power; to design, fabricate and maintain mechanical systems; to process data electronically; to wholesale and retail merchandise; * * * to maintain the horticultural beauty of city; to assist in finding solutions to the management of solid waste * * *."

Without becoming involved in the shifting educational ideologies, the two views illustrated above generally outline the positions held by both camps as to the type of education appropriate to a land-grant college or university.

While these views were perhaps equally held during the first 20 to 30 years of the life of the Morrill Act, the second, purely vocational view became more and more in the minority thereafter.

Several cases may be taken to exemplify this shift and also to point out the extraordinary diversity of ways in which the Morrill Act has been used. Illinois Industrial University, started as a purely vocational enterprise under the act, changed its name in 1885 to Illinois University and offered a great variety of courses of every kind.

The Ohio State University, also established under the act, from its beginning, supported the arts and sciences and soon successfully challenged the State's established colleges.

Its first president pledged that the university would maintain the principle of "education of a man as a man, rather than that which equips him for a particular post of duty."

In each of these cases, State and land-grant funds were combined. In the case of the Indiana University and Cornell, land-grant and private moneys were combined. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology based its extraordinary rise in the theoretical sciences on shared land-grant funds.

Clearly, there is no single model for the college or university dependent on land-grant funds. At the same time, there are several successful combinations of factors. In general, no successful land-grant institution has stayed with the idea of a vocational core.

The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, in describing the nature and history of land grant institutions clearly states that they "never were intended to be mere vocational schools."

SHIFT FROM TRAINING TO THEORY

As educational needs shifted these institutions responded by lessening their scientific requirements and broadening the elective base to include more work in the liberal arts, social science, and humanities.

Even in the vocational courses, the association points out that there has been an increasing shift from training to theory, simply because of the necessary order of priority which places theory first and application second in any except the most simple, ill-paid operations.

This shift might be described in capsule as one from vocational technical training to professional technical education.

In summary, then, even though the purely vocational idea was powerful during the first generation of land-grant colleges and universities, it has been set aside on varying grounds and been replaced with a much broader framework.

This broader framework has also been developed successfully in many different ways, all of which has placed the arts and sciences at the center of the institution.

Generally, the underlying assumption has been that education—as opposed to training—must treat the student as a complete person and that the creative and theoretical core of any discipline must be understood before its application can be drawn.

H.R. 15643 RETURNS TO A POSITION HELD A CENTURY AGO

There seems to be no way to escape the conclusion and judgment that H.R. 15643 returns to a position held a century ago and entirely discredited by both the theory and practice of education in land-grant institutions of whatever variety for at least the past 50 years.

The conclusion that to pass such a bill would be to condemn public higher education in the District to repeat a good part of the painful and expensive errors of the past century of higher education seems to me also inescapable.

If this committee should accept a conclusion such as I have suggested based upon the appropriate history and thoroughly documented elsewhere, it may wish to modify the proposed bill, despite the fact that home rule for the District is a reality.

WISCONSIN IDEA

If so, it may wish to consider as a model, the widely respected and imitated Wisconsin idea, whereby the University of Wisconsin was conceived to be a public service institution in the broadest sense—even to the point that it provided the principal research facilities for the State government, skilled personnel in many fields and at the same time maintained its integrity and independence to become one of the country's two or three finest universities.

Such a close but honorable connection between a university and the political and economic life of the general community seems to me particularly appropriate for the District of Columbia.

A close study of how that was accomplished is available in print.

Whatever the final judgement of this committee in this matter, whether to kill or amend or whatever, my personal expectation is that in an enterprise as important and forward-looking as a land-grant university for a city which is largely black and often poor, this committee's decision will show a depth of understanding and excellence of homework which this bill, H.R. 15643, conspicuously lacks.

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much, Dr. Brent.

PASS OR FILE

Do you prefer to have this committee pass the measure with amendments, if necessary, or to file the bill?

Dr. BRENT. I certainly would like the committee to file it.

Senator INOUYE. Thank you, sir.

Dr. Beverly Cassara.

Dr. CASSARA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As dean of the Graduate School of Federal City College and as a professional adult educator, I would first of all reiterate two objections

to H.R. 15643 (the District of Columbia Postsecondary Education Reorganization Act) which have already been stressed.

TIMING IS UNFORTUNATE

First, the timing is unfortunate. That a university should be created for the District of Columbia on the eve of home rule, however well intended the motivation may be, and however much overdue such an institution may be, in fact, robs the new government of one of its vital responsibilities—a responsibility which will serve the District best if the people of the District take this action themselves.

If they do the work of studying the situation; informing themselves of the alternatives; choosing the educational goals most desirable for District citizens, young and old; making the decisions and carrying out the plan; the new institution will have served to educate those planning it as well as those who study in its programs.

MUST THINK IN TERMS OF BROAD AND LONG-RANGE NEEDS

Second, we must think in terms of broad and long-range needs of the District of Columbia, in particular, and civilization in general.

While the vocational training aspects of the higher education system of the District are extremely important, we must not let the need for technical training warp our view so that we sell the future short.

There is a continuing need, perhaps a greater need than ever before, to educate the whole person, to educate in the liberal arts and human sciences.

If as a country we have developed technology that will put men on the Moon, our human and humane problems are not to be solved so quickly and efficiently, and indeed will not be solved at all without a very broad-based distribution of liberal arts education.

Ignorance enslaves and demeans, bringing feelings of helplessness, hopelessness, and fear which result in antisocial behavior, such as violence.

In order to be masters of technology and not be mastered by it, our people need understanding of our past (history), of the forces that shape society (sociology and anthropology), of the forces that motivate us (psychology), of the things that bring beauty and contentment to our lives (fine arts), of the nature of forces that shape our world (physics and chemistry), and especially an understanding of the greatest good for all persons (ethics).

Technological education provides students with training for jobs, but the future depends on those who not only can understand and practice a trade or profession, but also realize that human life cannot be taken for granted and must be studied in all its facets if it is to be preserved.

NOT THE APPROPRIATE MOMENT

Third, I would like to suggest that this may not be the appropriate moment for joining two young institutions.

As dean of the graduate school, with the self-study and the accreditation process immediately behind us, I am very well aware that we need time to consolidate our gains so rapidly achieved.

Our six fledgling graduate programs show great promise, but there is much to be done. Our direction at the moment is clear. We have sorted out our challenges and have accepted certain patterns of growth for the immediate future.

We need a year or two to pay strict attention to developing programs and courses that suit the needs of our clientele. We need to do this now unencumbered with the problems of the politics of structural reorganization.

NOT READY TO OFFER THE DOCTORATE

Also the title "university" usually implies programs for doctoral study. While it is our hope that one day we will provide this service which is much needed by our clientele, especially in the light of the affirmative action hiring programs being implemented by the various States, we would not be ready to offer the doctorate until probably 4 or 5 years from now.

Therefore, it seems a bit presumptuous to take the name "university" until we are prepared to fulfill that role and earn the academic prestige that accompanies that status.

PASS OR FILE

Senator INOUYE. Dr. Cassara, am I correct to conclude from your statement that you would be in favor of this committee filing this measure?

Dr. CASSARA. Very much so.

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much.

Dr. Ronald Williams.

OPPOSES UNIVERSITY AS PROPOSED

Dr. WILLIAMS. As one who has been centrally involved in higher education in the District of Columbia for the past 3 years and in the States of Ohio and Washington for the past 9 years, I must oppose the University of the District of Columbia as proposed in H.R. 15643 because [1] it fails most notably in its central conception of creating a university and [2] it brings together radically different educational units that can better achieve their goals and remain truer to their purpose by remaining administratively and functionally distinct institutions.

My first objection is that the proposed legislation does not create a university or even a structure from which a university might emerge.

The proposal brings together a 4-year comprehensive liberal arts college and a vocational-technical institute.

Why the objection to this bill?

GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Simply because what is crucial to a common understanding of a university is the emphasis on graduate and professional education.

Graduate and professional education require more elaborate and expensive facilities, require more faculty to undertake the training and education of graduate and professional students, and require more funding to support research and graduate student assistance.

Without such funding, one hardly has a university, but rather an assemblage of units that were formerly known as a college and an institute that are now called a university.

I mention the need to build in adequate funding for a quality university because in House deliberations reported in the Congressional Record, July 29, 1974, assurances were given that additional programs and funds are not required to establish the university.

Thus, from the very beginning the base on which any quality university must stand is snatched from the proposed institution.

It appears that a commitment to graduate and professional education is lacking, unless there are other intentions operating that are not included in the proposed bill and in the remarks recorded in the Congressional Record.

SIMPLY BEING THROWN TOGETHER

Surely if one relies on these two sources for an understanding of how the proposed university is to develop, he has little to be optimistic about, for a college and a vocational training school are simply being thrown together and inappropriately labeled a university.

The logical question that surely must be asked is, why the haste to create so little in so little time?

Would it not be better to allow more time so as to include more people in planning an institution that would deserve being called a university, rather than what is proposed in H.R. 15643?

INCLUDING A COMMUNITY COLLEGE INTO THE UNIVERSITY STRUCTURE

My second objection has to do with including a community college, in this instance a vocational-technical institute, into the university structure.

Clearly, as the pattern across the country seems to indicate, the purpose, structure, staff, and resources of a community college differ markedly from a 4-year comprehensive college or a university.

For me the question is not whether vocational education is preferable to academic or professional education, or vice versa.

CREATE A UNIVERSITY THAT WILL BE CAPABLE OF SERVING ANY POPULATION

That is not the issue; although because the population of the District is currently predominantly black, some might want to couch the argument in those terms.

And there has been a continuous argument about the kind of education that blacks should receive. I am confident, though, that the architects of the proposed university are guided by the impulse to create a university that will be capable of serving any population and to provide the best and most comprehensive education for that population.

That must be the guiding principle in the ultimate design of a public higher education structure, for the demographic shading of cities changes, just as the District is experiencing shifts in its population today.

VOCATIONAL AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The appropriate goal for the planners of postsecondary education is to create a structure that will provide the best 2-year educational training, including vocational and technical, and the best baccalaureate, graduate, and professional education available.

Two-year vocational colleges, including vocational and technical institutes, were developed to pursue goals that are quite distinct from those of the 4-year traditional colleges.

The community college emphasizes technical and vocational training, requiring that its staffing and curriculum remain sensitive to the blue collar and skilled white collar job market and the needs of that market.

It is an institution which by design has been created with flexibility to respond immediately to the needs of the business and industrial community while, in a limited manner, being able to offer a curriculum that allows students to continue their education, if they so desire, in traditional colleges and universities.

In meeting its goals, the community college attracts faculty and staff who bring with them experience in technical areas, not necessarily the credentials required in the 4-year colleges and universities.

The implications are quite apparent: The faculty and staff of the community college should be and usually are different from that found in the more traditional institutions of higher education.

It is also clear that one does not build a university out of a community college faculty. By training, education, effort and purpose, these faculties differ.

While the faculty in the 4-year college and university is more concerned with academic pursuits, research, liberal education, and professional training, the faculty in the 2-year institution trains students in technical and vocational areas where a limited amount, if any, of theoretical and research responsibility is required.

As I said earlier, the question is not whether one kind of training is preferred to another. The population of the District, like all other populations in the country, needs alternative educational systems of high quality to prepare its residents for a wide spectrum of educational and career opportunities.

The only question begging for resolution is just what structure can best do the job?

My view, which agrees with the opinion stated in the Chase report as quoted by President Russell of Federal City College, is that the goals of the vocational institution would be seriously compromised by its inclusion into a university structure.

It is equally true that the aims of a university are often antagonistic to those of a community college.

COMMUNITY VOCATIONAL COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SHOULD BE SEPARATE AND DISTINCT

In terms of its goals and function, the community vocational college should remain administratively and functionally independent. Universities tend to emphasize those disciplines and professions that are characteristic and traditional to them.

The same can be said of community vocational colleges. Both seem to flourish best when each is given a clearly defined and autonomous structure.

To be poor means to have restricted possibilities, fewer alternatives. Many residents of the District have lived within these restrictions too long. By maintaining a separate vocational college and a separate university, we can at last insure that the residents of the District will have adequate alternative educational systems available to them.

It follows from everything that I have said that I believe the best course of action would be for Congress to give the residents of the District, through their elected representatives, the responsibility for constructing a postsecondary educational system to meet their needs, one that would also be assured adequate financial support to insure its quality and growth.

Yet if it is the wisdom of the Congress to move contrary to this position, I suggest vigorously that the Federal City College, that is, the prospective expanded college which will include the District of Columbia Teachers College, become the university and that the Washington Technical Institute remain a separate and distinct entity, free to pursue its own unique training and educational goals.

Naturally, both institutions should report to the same Board of Trustees in order to assure a minimum of duplication of curriculum. In this manner, the District would be provided with the basic ingredients for a sound educational system, rich in its promise to all its students both today and tommorrow.

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much, sir.

Dr. Russell?

Dr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, just as a matter of summary, we believe that the university created by H.R. 15643 should be opposed for two major reasons.

CONTRADICTS THE SPIRIT OF THE HOME RULE MOVEMENT

[1] The bill contradicts the spirit of the home rule movement, because it is a congressional action affecting the future of the District's higher education structure just when the citizens are on the verge of implementing self-government

DIFFERENT TYPES OF EDUCATION

[2] Community-college-type vocational and technical training, on the one hand, and baccalaureate and graduate liberal arts and sciences, on the other, are quite different types of education in their pace, style, standards of performance, etc.

Grouped together in one institution, they may encounter problems in trying to integrate that could well be costly to them both.

We would also note there is a question of maturation taking place with the question of the District of Columbia Teachers College.

The two institutions otherwise invlved are in the development process.

Most land-grant universities, such as described by Professor Brent, grow gradually from agricultural and mechanical colleges into full-fledged universities. Federal City College now has the only graduate department of the three institutions.

UNIVERSITY STATUS

The concept of university with strong graduate training will take some time or a new and different type of initiative before FCC's graduate departments are of university status.

Federal City College and Washington Technical Institute have been growing slowly but surely. It must be stated that District of Columbia Teachers College has been choked by lack of finance. Each of these make excellent use of additional resources, to strengthen the current programs, and extension of many others.

ORDERLY NATURAL GROWTH PROCESS

Building on the excellent foundations laid by these institutions would be an orderly natural growth process, which we believe would be in the best interest of the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, we thank you very much.

Senator INOUYE. Without objection, your full prepared statement will be made part of the record.

Lady and gentlemen, I thank you very much.

Dr. RUSSELL. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Russell and letters received from Federal City College officials follow:]

STATEMENT BY DR. WENDELL P. RUSSELL, PRESIDENT OF FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE, IN OPPOSITION TO THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AS PROPOSED IN H.R. 15643, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION REORGNIZATION ACT

The University created by H.R. 15643 is opposed for two major reasons. (1) The Bill contradicts the spirit of the home-rule movement, because it is a Congressional action affecting the future of the District's higher education structure just when the citizens are on the verge of implementing self-government. (2) Community-college-type vocational and technical training, on the one hand, and baccalaureate and graduate liberal arts and sciences, on the other, are quite different types of education in their pace, style, standards of performance, etc. Grouped together in one institution, they may encounter problems in trying to integrate that could well be costly to them both.

Untimely Imposition of Congressional Will

While we appreciate the interest the House of Representatives has shown in post-secondary education in the District of Columbia, we see no pressing need for consolidation of the existing institutions to take place in the immediate future. Residents of the District of Columbia are presently involved in the first general primary election campaign Washington, D.C., has entertained in over a century. Within months, the District will have at its helm a new elected City Council and Mayor. The job of determining the structure of public post-secondary education reasonably falls within their scope of responsibility, just as it is the responsibility of state legislatures across the country where other land-grant colleges are concerned.

The concern Congress has shown for public higher education in the District over the past ten years has been exemplary and, indeed, has resulted in the establishment of two fine education institutions -- Federal City College and Washington Technical Institute. Now, it should be up to the new City Council and new Mayor of the District of Columbia -- officials elected by the citizens--to decide the structure and future of a university for the citizens they represent.

If the Congress wishes, at this time, to make known its continuing interest in the District's public higher education structure, perhaps it would suffice to convey the sense of Congress through a resolution commending the public post-secondary education efforts of the District to date and recommending careful consideration of their future by the new elected government.

Or, if it is the desire of Congress to go on record as favoring consolidation of the public post-secondary education institutions, a resolution to that effect may be sufficient. It may be possible for Congress to give a mandate to the new government to effect a consolidation without specifying its structure, limitations, and governing regulations as this bill does. For example, some state universities have effectively consolidated under a chancellor while preserving considerable diversity and autonomy among the colleges in the university system, each with its own president. The District of Columbia government should have the option of studying various alternatives in any proposed consolidation to arrive at the best possible public post-secondary education structure to meet the needs of the citizens.

Inadvisability of Combining Diverse Educational Systems

Washington Technical Institute offers, almost exclusively, two year programs of vocational and technical training. Federal City College emphasizes four-year baccalaureate education in the liberal arts and sciences, business, and education as well as a number of graduate programs. The two institutions are based on quite different traditions and philosophies as to the means and ends of post-secondary education. Ordinarily, they are not in any form of conflict with each other, because there is ample need and ample room for both kinds of education in our city. When they are brought together in a single institution, however, the many differences between them, especially the different goals they strive for, may well throw them into unproductive competition with each other.

Will it be possible to group two such diverse and potentially competitive educational programs and philosophies in one institution without one or the other gaining dominance? We are concerned that it may not be. And we believe, from our study of the Congressional debate on H.R. 15643 and after careful scrutiny of the Bill itself, that Congress has wrestled with this same problem -- how to consolidate two such unlike institutions into one.

Unfortunately, the solution the House of Representatives referred to the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia -- H.R. 15643 -- tends to promote the supremacy of the vocational programs by declaring,"...the programs of technical and vocational education of the Washington Technical Institute are hereby determined to be sound and valid and shall be used as the basis for a unit of the University committed to furthering job oriented courses of study." The language of the Bill appears to protect the interests of vocational and technical training without offering this same protection to courses of study in the liberal arts and sciences.

Certainly, both vocational and technical training and liberal arts and sciences should be afforded their proper roles within the post-secondary educational structure of the District of Columbia. Each, however, needs to be protected from the other to ensure an equitable relationship for all within a system of post-secondary education. The Presidential Commission formed in 1964 to consider higher education in the District of Columbia -- generally known as the "Chase Commission" -- strongly recommended the establishment of

two separate higher education institutions for the District of Columbia. Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute were the results of this recommendation.

The Chase Commission explained why two separate institutions were necessary:

> The Committee strongly urges that each of the two institutions it has recommended--the community college and the college of arts and sciences--should have its own faculty, administrative staff and physical plant. While there would be advantages in locating the two institutions reasonably close to each other in order that certain facilities such as libraries could be utilized in common, the administrative union of the two facilities into a single institution would seriously compromise one or the other, or even both.
>
> Throughout the United States, very few 4-year institutions offer as part of their overall program the terminal technical and general education programs characteristic of the community college. Technical education has its own rationale, its own curricular style and, most importantly, its own relationship with the field of occupational employment. The 4-year college or university should certainly teach effectively at all levels, but inevitably its attention will most often be on its advanced courses, the scholarly attitudes in its students. The community college, on the other hand, can concentrate on undergraduate training in its vocational and technical programs and on the best possible programs of general education and basic preparation for later academic work. These quite different emphases are extremely difficult to maintain within a single institution.
>
> Technical education, moreover, needs it own teaching staff, whose background, training, interests and attitudes are ordinarily different from those in the older academic disciplines. With these differences in orientation, the teaching staff of a comprehensive junior college is unlikely to work effectively or in harmony with the staff of the senior college. The curriculum for the electronic technician, for example, is not the same as that of the first 2 years for the electrical engineer, and the faculty in electrical engineering may neither understand nor take any interest in a program for technicians.

> Moreover, the standards for admission to the community college must accomodate a far greater range of abilities among its applicants than those of the college of arts and sciences, and must be based on quite different criteria. The comprehensive community college should, as already noted, attract many students of high ability, but it should also admit anyone who may profit from its courses, and should actively encourage even the low achievers in high school to undertake further occupational training and as much general education as they can assimilate. The college of arts and sciences, on the other hand, should maintain substantially higher academic standards for admission. If combined into a single institution, however, the tendency would be overwhelming to regard the community college as simply a place for the less able students--and, in that way, to deny to it sources of strength that are essential to its success.

Ten years after publication of the Chase Commission report, the validity of its conclusions and recommendations is being proven and confirmed in a most unfortunate way -- a previous version of H.R. 15643 contained language even more profoundly weighted in favor of vocational and technical education than the present version. Even if all such language is excised from the Bill, the basic potential for destructive competition between the two diverse types of education vying against each other in a single institution bodes ill for both of them. Both vocational and technical training and the liberal arts and sciences would be better off remaining in their separate institutional settings.

Should economy and efficiency be the determining considerations for Congress's final position on this Bill, we suggest that these issues might best be dealt with by establishing (or recommending to the District Government) a "Board of Post-Secondary Education," which would have the responsibility of ensuring that each institution reporting to the Board namely FCC and WTI--would receive equitable consideration. At the same time, putting both institutions under one Board would provide the greatest opportunity to ensure economical and efficient use of resources among the two. Such a Board would have the authority to establish policies, root out unneeded duplication of programs, and decide on financial questions.

While friendly competition for grants and students can be stimulating among institutions, it has the potential for destructiveness in a single institution. Divisiveness and hostility would certainly not serve the District of Columbia well in its efforts to "catch up" with the other land grant colleges and universities.

There is also a question of maturation. In most instances, land grant universities grew gradually from agricultural and mechanical colleges into full-fledged universities. Federal City College now has the only graduate departments of the two institutions. The concept of "university" implies a strong graduate school. It will take some time -- or a new and different type of initiative--before FCC's graduate departments are of university status.

FCC and WTI have been growing slowly but surely. Each could make excellent use of additional resources to strengthen some current programs and extend others. Building upon the excellent foundations laid by these two institutions would be an orderly and, if you will, natural growth process which we believe would be in the best interests of the District of Columbia.

Consolidation at this time would only adversely affect the gains made by both institutions.

Peoples Government Association

425 Second Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone 727-2460

FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE

July 26, 1974

The Honorable Thomas Eagleton
Dirksen Senate Office Building
Room 6235
Washington, D. C. 20515

My Dear Senator:

We draw your attention to a bill which has been introduced in the House of Representatives (H.R. 15643) before the 93rd Congress, Second Session. This bill is to re-organize public higher education in the District of Columbia, establish a Board of Trustees, authorize and direct a Board of Trustees to consolidate the existing local institutions of public higher education into a single land-grant university of the District of Columbia, and other purposes.

The following position is being entered on behalf of the entire student body of the Federal City College. We support the concept of the University of the District of Columbia based on the mass population of the metropolitan area that have had to succumb to a lesser education within this area for various reasons.

At Federal City College, what should be the optimum amount of specialization in the curriculum? At what point should highly specialized subjects be introduced, and how much should they be emphasized? As outside vocational demands have more and more influence on secondary and advanced education alike, it is easy to emphasize technical courses on the grounds that they fit individuals more adequate for their future occupations.

However, the bit-and-pieces character of much of liberal arts education should be well-recognized, and various attempts have already been made to develop a liberal arts education as the "core of general education" at Federal City College. This core, which represents those parts of total course study is conditionally mandatory for all students, consists of materials organized without regard to traditional subject matter divisions. Various general orientation and survey courses in the sciences and humanities make up this approach at the college level. The needs of this community bear and indirect influence upon the core curriculum of the University of the District of Columbia.

2.

We the students of Federal City College are firmly opposed to the Booker T. Washington concept of education and their alliances who are supportive of the aforementioned bill. When Booker T. Washington made his interesting and valid address at the Atlantic Exposition in 1895 many appreciated his position. Thereafter, Tuskegee Institute was created and came under the direction and influence of Booker T. Washington. At the time, the economy of the South called for such and institution, and the political atmosphere as it related to the Black population necessitated the creation of a vocational core institute, which was Tuskegee. But, that was 1895 !!! This is 1974 !!! There seems to be a conflict based around the socio-economic and political needs of this society as it relates then and now.

It is quite clear that in 1974 we should be of the position of W.E.B. DuBois. It is not our intention to engage in any discussions which tend to negate the importance of Washington Technical Institute, however, we would be dishonest to both our intellect and our interest if we were to accept positions presented by Mrs. Pinkett (see attachment no. 1). There can be no proper or correct analysis of Mrs. Pinkett's position until we first deal with the fallacies and deceit which are an integral part of her letter to Congressman Diggs. One example is the citation of the fact that the Federal Aviation Agency has accredited Washington Technical Institute's aviation maintenance technology program. This reliance on a maintenance program serves only to demonstrate that Washington Technical Institute perpetuates the myth, that Black people are capable of only limited achievements in the field of aviation. Washington Technical Institute has no program to train pilots; and since no program exist, can we not conclude that those who have planned the curriculum for Washington Technical Institute assumed or accepted that Blacks lacked the intelligence to pilot planes. The United States Air Force has over 22,000 pilots, but leas than 230 of these are Black. Washington Techinal Institute's maintenance technical program has not prepared the students of this city for careers as engineers who design airplanes and other aeronautical equipment. It is significant that so few Black men have not participated in the space program in its efforts and there have been no Black astronauts. Specifically, because institutions have held to archaic positions of training Blacks for limited placement. The banal expressions or positions of those Blacks and whites who align themselves with the Shockley's, Jink's, and Jensen's serve to promote the interest of the racial supremist. Only a four-year college is capable of preparing the students of this city for positions within engineering careers.

3.

All societies have some provisions, formal and informal or both, for socilization of individuals. In dictatorial societies, a central purpose of education is to develop loyalty and subservience to the state. As we see it, in democracies, the purpose of education is to develop individuals who are both self-sufficient and capable of making the democratic system work.

Respectfully,

Joseph T. Gatling

Joseph T. Gatling, Chairman
Peoples Government Association

Attachment (1)

Aug 1.

THE FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE
OFFICE OF THE DEAN
SCHOOL OF LIBERAL AND FINE ARTS
425 second street, n.w., washington, d.c. 20001
(202) 727-2537

August 7, 1974

Honorable Charles Diggs
Chairman, Committee On The
District of Columbia
Congress Of The United States
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Diggs:

I express herewith my request and hope that certain sections of the purpose of the District of Columbia Public Postsecondary Education Reorganization Act, to wit, page 19, line 14, and page 26, lines 13-17 be considered seriously and with extreme caution. May I suggest that the fear expressed by the Washington Technical Institute President, Cleveland Denard, and Board of Higher Education Chairperson, Flaxie Pinkett, that vocational and technical training programs might be subordinated or lost in a large university structure, could not only be allayed but obviated by maintaining the Technical Institute as a separate entity in its present state and form as was suggested in the Chase Report (Report of the President's Committee on Public Higher Education in the District of Columbia.)

May I further suggest that all fundings, both land grant and appropriated, be available to all components of postsecondary education units in the District of Columbia to the extent demonstrated by their academic and community value and their related budgetary needs.

Sincerely,

John D. Butler

John D. Butler, Dean

cc: Ronald Williams
Members of the Committee of
the District of Columbia

JDB:jaj

THE FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE
FACULTY ORGANIZATION
425 Second Street, N.W. # 3229
Washington, D. C. 20001

Aug 13 10 49 AM '74

August 9, 1974

Senator Thomas Eagleton, Chairman
Senate Committee on the District of Columbia
Everett McKinley Dirksen Senate Office Building
First and C Streets, N.E.
Washington, D. C. 20001

Dear Senator Eagleton:

The faculty members of Federal City College are concerned that passage of legislation organizating public higher education in the District of Columbia would be considered seriously prior to receipt of a recommendation from the newly established City Council and Mayor pursuant to the recently passed Home Rule Legislation. Faculty members feel that the concept of local control of education demands that initiation of changes in the educational system rest with the city government notwithstanding assestments of the efficiency or lack thereof of the system by members of other communities.

As a purely educational matter it is strongly felt here that H.R. 15643, "District of Columbia Public Higher Education Act," depicts an ill conceived educational structure when considered in the light of District of Columbia needs.

This letter is therefore written to urge your committee to reject H.R. 15643.

Sincerely yours,

James E. Joseph

James E. Joseph, Chairman

cc: Senator Charles MacMathias
Senator Daniel Inouye
Senator Adalai Stevenson III
Senator John Tunney
Senator Dewey Bartlett
Senator Pete Domenici

Senator INOUYE. Our next panel of witnesses will include Dr. Cleveland Dennard, president of the Washington Technical Institute; Mrs. Jean Sisco, vice chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Washington Technical Institute; and Mr. George L. P. Weaver, president of the Board of Trustees of the Washington Technical Institute.

Lady and gentlemen, welcome.

Dr. Dennard.

STATEMENTS OF: DR. CLEVELAND DENNARD, PRESIDENT; JEAN SISCO, VICE CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF TRUSTEES; AND GEORGE L. P. WEAVER, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF TRUSTEES, WASHINGTON TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

Mr. WEAVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to defer to Mrs. Jean Sisco, the vice chairman of our Board.

Senator INOUYE. Mrs. Sisco.

Mrs. SISCO. Mr. Chairman, we are going to submit a written statement later. We thought we would address ourselves very shortly just to the specific questions that you seem to be addressing to the other folks who have come before you.

Senator INOUYE. The record will be kept open to receive the statements.

Mr. Sisco. Thank you.

FEDERAL VERSUS LOCAL

Why Congress, rather than the soon-to-be elected government of the District of Columbia?

I have supported home rule for so long, I can understand why the question is being asked, and I certainly feel that there is very strong support in the newly elected government to make the decision, as to what will be done for education for the District of Columbia, but our thinking has gone along a little bit different lines, and maybe I should explain it to you.

First of all, Congress created these institutions, specifically: Federal City College and Washington Technical Institute.

We are in a little bit different position over at WTI. We are even more a product of the national Government, because we have been appointed by the President, as members of the board.

We have some basic concerns as to where we go from a Federal versus a local government point of view, specifically, directed toward land grant, what is the step necessary for WTI to convert from a federally oriented board to a locally appointed board.

Our original discussions as to the possibility of one university which I think is truly the key of all of the discussion on H.R. 15643, regardless of what form you want it to take, had to do at the beginning with meetings between the boards as to very grave concern over duplication of expenditures, of efforts, and what we could best do for the students of these two universities, schools, and technical schools.

AVOID WASTE AND DUPLICATION

D.C. teachers fit in there as well. We have had for some number of years sessions between the three institutions, their faculties, their administrative offices, as well as members of the board to question what to do to avoid waste and duplication.

There has been, as you would expect, a great deal of rivalry, as to the attraction of funds, both from Congress and locally, and there has been a great deal of questioning since the inception of the two schools as to the land-grant funds, and their use.

It is my understanding, and I am certainly not an educator, and I will bow to folks who have come before me, that basically we have felt this has been our direction. As board members of WTI, we are very proud of what we have done. It has taken us a long time, a lot of planning and effort to get a good technical school going in the District.

CONCERNED ABOUT LAMEDUCK SITUATION

Our question is, if Congress does not act now, will we be put as we were when this institution was first established?

It took us about 3 years to get the thing going. We are now in the midst of a big building program out on Connecticut and Massachusetts Avenues. We have been accredited. We have some very good programs going, which we feel are securing jobs, and real directions for young people, and continuing education for people who are presently mature citizens of the District. So we are concerned about sort of the lameduck situation where we are sort of half swan and half goose.

CITY COUNCIL COULD NOT ACT RAPIDLY

We do not know what we will be. We are in a position where we saw this act as coming along, and to get started, and to keep the momentum, the passage of a bill which would then turn us over to the newly elected representatives of the people of the District of Columbia, and they would carry on from there, because we feel if we are put in this hiatus, and assuming the best timing on it is January, I just do not feel anything really could be done by the City Council that rapidly.

It takes you budgetwise, in your planning, and in your academic year. We are talking about planning, there can be about a year and a half in advance of the actual fact of the students getting in and starting the classes. So our concern, I am afraid, deals more in the questioning of the administration, how to convert from one system to the other, without sort of a broad blueprint which we saw this act being, that would get us over this period, without stopping the momentum that I think these three schools have. Particularly as they have done very well in the last year or two of getting themselves directed, and I think our institution has.

Those would be my individual responses to what you are asking, and perhaps not as well stated as someone a little bit more deeply involved in the actual administration of the schools; but that is the way I understand it.

EFFECT OF DELAY

Senator INOUYE. Are you suggesting that a delay of 6 months or a year would irreparably damage WTI?

Mrs. SISCO. I would not be that presumptuous. I could not say that. I am saying though that having been intimately involved with the progress that this school has made, and knowing what is involved in the planning, I would hate to see anything stop a good running show. Consequently, if I felt that home rule could come forth, and we would have this thing in 6 months, that we would have a framework. Frankly, I will be out of office when the new institution takes over. So I am only looking at it from the point of view of trying to have some continuity, to get this thing established in the most expeditious way possible.

MANY DIFFERENT SUGGESTIONS

Senator INOUYE. I have no idea what the committee will do, or, for that matter, what the Senate will do, but I would assume if the Senate decided to act on this measure, it would require much time, obviously, because of the many suggestions made.

We have opinions that are covering the full spectrum of education.

We had a panel appearing just before you suggesting just the contrary to what you have suggested. Just on that basis alone, if the Congress had to act, I would suppose that this committee would prefer to act next year, assuming you did not have home rule, and we were forced to proceed legislatively.

I, for one, would hate to just have this 1 day of 3 hours of hearings, and make a decision one way or the other, just upon the weight of the testimony here.

CITY REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD MAKE THE DECISION

I would prefer very seriously, since this is the eve of home rule, something you have been working for, for many years, to have the elected representatives of this city make this determination.

It may be a good determination, it may be a bad one, but it still is the determination of the people of this city.

The people of the State of Hawaii, I am certain, have made some bad decisions since we have gotten statehood, but it was our decision, and that is what counts, as far as I am concerned.

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

Mrs. SISCO. The University of Hawaii, as I remember, and my facts may be wrong, but I understood, for instance, was not the University of Hawaii established by Federal grant?

Senator INOUYE. It is a land-grant college.

Mrs. SISCO. And established by the U.S. Government before Hawaii became a State?

Senator INOUYE. It was declared to be a land-grant university without any land.

Mrs. SISCO. It got the money, but no land. I think that is what happened in the District.

Senator INOUYE. The big Government in Washington was very generous. It declared us to be a land-grant university, but since we had no Federal land in Hawaii, it offered to give us about three mountaintops in Alaska.

I am not being facetious. So after statehood, the Federal Government and the State government negotiated, and in lieu of land, they provided the State of Hawaii several million dollars.

So up until statehood, it was called the Land-Grant University, but beyond that we had no support.

Mrs. SISCO. You saw the emergence of the University of Hawaii from something that had been regarded—it was controlled during its initial period by the Congress, was it?

Senator INOUYE. By the territory.

Mrs. SISCO. Did you have a difficult period of transition, or are you aware of that? This is the thing that really concerns me.

Senator INOUYE. The Governor of Hawaii with the concurrence of the Senate and the territory of Hawaii appointed the members of the board of regents.

They set the policy. The president of the university was appointed by the Governor of Hawaii. The major source of revenues for that university came from the citizens of Hawaii.

We received a little share that we got from the other Federal programs. Today it is a major university. We have about 30,000 full-time day students.

Mrs. SISCO. It is a fine school.

Senator INOUYE. If you include everything else—the community college system—one out of every 10 citizens of the State has taken part in some program there.

WILL OF THE PEOPLE

Mrs. SISCO. In your opinion, what if this act is not passed by Congress now, and assuming that the worse would come to worse, and that the City Council as elected could not move on this, or would not move on this, or did not consider this a priority item, and this thing would then go on for some period of time, would it be your opinion that the present Boards remain in effect, even though this is——

Senator INOUYE. If that is the will of the people, I would say so be it.

The University of Hawaii for a long time was a sad example of what a university should be. The government in Hawaii did not think too highly of it.

As a result, the children of the members of the Board never attended the University of Hawaii. The regents always sent their children abroad.

That is how much they thought of the University of Hawaii. So it was a place where only the poor folk sent their children. But times have changed, and today we spend a great portion of our tax income for the support of higher education.

This is the chance you will have to take here. If your City Council and the Mayor should decide that WTI, and higher education, should receive the lowest priority, you may have to live with that for 2 years, but I would expect the people of the District would throw all of the rascals out in the next election.

CONGRESS WILL STILL BE INVOLVED

Dr. DENNARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose a question, as chairman of the Finance Committee, I am very conscious, of course, of the source of revenue for higher education. This becomes doubly important with the efforts to develop a campus. I think just part of the answer is the new City Council coming in, because we will still have to come to Congress in the final analysis, as we have in the past years to defend our budget. So as I see it, Congress will still be involved.

Following up Mrs. Sisco's point of view, it seems to our Board that this was an excellent transitional step to provide a framework. Under the best of circumstances, a new City Council would take some time to get organized, to staff up, to be able to meet and wrestle with this problem. In the meantime, we are facing a very severe inflationary system in attempting to develop our campus, and all of the many other problems that are involved with financing higher education in the District of Columbia, which we will still have to come back to Congress for.

WILL OF THE PEOPLE

Senator INOUYE. As noted by you, unfortunately, the Congress of the United States will still have a strong voice in the activities of this city. It was not the position of this committee, let me assure you. We would prefer something much closer to full self-government, but we represented the minority.

I would think that even if the Congress did participate in providing a certain portion of the revenues, that the people of this city would want, to the greatest extent possible, to provide an input in the determination of policy, and the establishment of the structure itself. But if it is the will of the people here that they want outsiders like us making that determination—that is something else.

Dr. DENNARD. Sir, I do not think it is the will of the people.

As a resident here for 33 years and very active in the District affairs, as well as Federal Government affairs, through many of those years, I do not think it is the will.

PRACTICAL SITUATION

This is the practical situation that the citizenry of the District of Columbia find themselves in. We have a responsibility to the students which we are seeking to provide services for. We are strongly of the opinion that this provides the best kind of transitional step. That they will not have to suffer through any breakdown in the planning, or breakdown in the financing. We are up here every year defending a budget that has been insufficient each year to satisfy the proven and demonstrable needs and demands of the community, and we will have to come back.

It is not as if we had the ideal situation, where the city council could assume and accept this authority, but they can only assume and accept part of it.

FINANCING OF THE BUDGET

We still have to come back for one of the most important elements of education—for the financing of the budget. We will still have to defend our budget here in Congress. It seems it leaves us in the position, or a suggestion from a practical pragmatic point of view, of suggesting a possible position that may stretch out to a much longer time than has been suggested in the testimony this morning, or in some of the questions that have been posed.

Senator INOUYE. I do not see where you will have this problem of transition.

I really cannot see this, unless you are suggesting that an elected official may not be as responsive and responsible as an appointed one.

Dr. DENNARD. I am not suggesting that. I am only suggesting that the elected official can only be so responsive up to a point, because we still have to come back here for the most important element in satisfying the need and requirements of our student body.

Senator INOUYE. That is true whether the City Council acts on it, or we act on it.

Dr. DENNARD. That is true, but then the question of the loss of time has an effect. We are convinced it will have an effect on the continued orderly development of the institutions, and particularly the capital expenditures needed for the orderly development of the campus that we have been authorized to create.

AUTHORITY OF CITY COUNCIL

Mr. WEAVER. The Congress on two occasions has enacted legislation to create land-grant colleges in the District of Columbia: Public laws 93-50, and I believe 91-61, What the bill before us today does is something to rescind the action of those two previous congressional actions, and combine the institutions into one.

Likewise, it will abolish two boards of trustees, and creates one board of trustees.

The second aspect of the question is a legal question as to whether or not a city council under the provisions of the language of the home rule bill would in fact have the authority to abolish a board created by the Congress for Presidential appointments, even if it was determined that it had the authority, whether or not it would have the will to do so.

Senator INOUYE. In our mind, there is no question that the new city council will have the authority to abolish the Board if it so wishes.

Unfortunately, that action would be like all other legislative action, subject to a veto by the Congress, which I hope it would not exercise.

I should point out that when Hawaii was a territory, all of our legislative actions were subject to veto by the Congress, although in the 54 years, Congress did not exercise this veto.

Do you feel that the city council would not be inclined to look on the city problems with concern?

Dr. DENNARD. That is not the way I feel about it. I do not feel that anyone other than the Congress has the authority to extend and grant privileges to a political subdivision. No one else has that privilege. Since the Congress has made this decision on two occasions

that only the Congress can rescind its previous action. The enactment of this legislation is in effect the redesignating of the land-grant entity in the District of Columbia. Rather than having the Federal City College as a land-grant college, and the Washington Technical Institute as a land-grant college, the Congress would in effect through this piece of legislation create the University of the District of Columbia as the land-grant college, which would then make it eligible to participate in all of the other pieces of legislation that have accrued over the years to institutions so impoverished.

Senator INOUYE. The legislative counsel of the committee somehow does not concur with your conclusion. But you can be assured that you will be kept in mind. Obviously I am a bit subjective on this matter as you have certainly noted by now.

CONSIDER THE ELEMENT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

I will try to suggest to my colleagues that they consider the element of self-government, which is around the corner for the people of the District of Columbia. However, that is not to suggest that I am absolutely opposed.

I will look into this matter further, but I must say that I would very much prefer to have the people of this city make this determination. If the determination is a bad one, then you will have to live with it, because some of those elected may not be the finest in your eyes, but they are the finest in the eyes of those who voted for them.

Dr. DENNARD. That was never the presupposition, Mr. Chairman.

We thought the hearings held on March 21 and 30 representing organizations having memberships in excess of some 300,000 people indicated that their preference was that the Congress act on the question of creating a public university in the District, and remand to the City Council the responsibility for elementary and secondary education. It was on that basis that the city's citizenry through all-day hearings, and the submission of the testimony from those hearings that was submitted to the House District Committee; so, looking only at those three items, the request on the part of the citizenry to have the Congress act on a land-grant public university on the one hand, and to rescind its previous action in creating two land-grant colleges in the District, and resolving the question whether or not the City Council could abolish such represented the three central issues I believe in this regard.

Senator INOUYE. I thank you very much.

Dr. DENNARD. Thank you.

[Dr. Dennard's prepared statement follows:]

WASHINGTON TECHNICAL INSTITUTE
4100 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008 (202) 629-7307

United States Senate
Committee on the District of Columbia
5 September 1974

STATEMENT

Mr. Chairman, my name is Cleveland L. Dennard, President of the Washington Technical Institute. To my right is Mrs. Jean H. Sisco, Vice Chairman of the Institute's Board and Mr. George L-P Weaver, a member of the Board and Chairman of its Committee on Budget and Finance. Our joint statement is submitted herewith in support of H.R. 15643, presently under consideration by the Committee.

The legislative action taken by the 90th and 91st Congresses in designating Federal City College and Washington Technical Institute as land-grant institutions in the District of Columbia, in accordance with 7 U.S.C. 13, known as the First Morrill Act of 1862, in contrast to the designation merely of the District of Columbia as a land-grant recipient, leaving to the District of Columbia the responsibility for designating the specific institutions to benefit from the grant, presents a critical issue in the consideration of H.R. 15643. In contrast to the situation which would exist, had the Congress not specifically designated the beneficiary institutions, the Congress having created the institutions and subseqently named them as recipients of land-grant funds, only it can repeal or amend its previous action. The legislation now before you would so amend Public Laws 89-791, 90-350, and 91-650 to create a University of the District of Columbia and designate it, as successor to Federal City College and Washington Technical Institute, as the institution within the District of Columbia to receive land-grant funds.

H.R. 15643 would reorganize public higher education in the District of Columbia through the creation of a University of the District of Columbia. The Bill provides for a single Board of Trustees to replace the Mayorally-appointed Board of Higher Education which oversees Federal City College and the District of Columbia Teachers College as well as the Presidentially-appointed Board of Vocational Education which oversees Washington Technical Institute. The Bill would, thus, provide for a consolidation, under a new board placing the existing local institutions of public higher education into a single land-grant university.

It has been suggested that congressional action dealing with higher education in the District of Columbia may not be appropriate at this time in view of the provisions of Public Law 93-198, the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganizational Act, delegating certain legislative authority previously exercised by the Congress to the District of Columbia City Council as the legislative body for the District of Columbia. This suggestion, however, does not take into account specific limitations placed by Congress upon the City Council. Section 602 (a)(3), Title VI, Public Law 93-198, provides that the Council shall have no authority to "...enact any act, or enact any act to amend or repeal any act of Congress, which concerns the functions or property of the United States..." Whether or not the Congress had in mind the provisions of the Morrill Act of 1862 when it imposed this limitation on the City Council, the limitation clearly prohibits the City Council from repealing acts of Congress which designated Federal City College and Washington Technical Institute as beneficiary institutions and established a Presidentially-appointed Board of Vocational Education. Only if the Congress repeals its own prior legislation could the City Council of the District of Columbia designate a new institution as recipient of land-grant funds in accordance with the provisions of the First Morrill Act of 1862; and only Congress can abolish the Presidentially-appointed Board of Vocational Education which it created. Only if the Congress amends its previous designation of specific recipient institutions could the new District of Columbia City Council designate another institution as a "state" land-grant institution.

The District of Columbia and the new City Council will best be served at this time by definitive congressional action to assist in the quick and orderly progress needed in the field of higher education. If no action is taken now, the new City Council will, quite simply, be faced with the burdensome task of beginning anew the effort to obtain congressional legislation to create a land-grant University of the District of Columbia. Enactment of H.R. 15643 now, would assist the new Council by providing a blueprint for action in the field of higher education in accordance with the expressed desires and needs of the citizens of the District of Columbia. Enactment of H.R. 15643 would demonstrate congressional willingness to assist the new District of Columbia Government to eliminate legal obstacles to its prompt and definitive action and prevent its becoming enmeshed in a legal thicket.

The overwhelming public sentiment expressed during the course of hearings conducted in March 1974 through the joint sponsorship of the Board of Higher Education, the Board of Vocational Education and the D.C. Council's Committee on Education, Manpower and Youth Affairs, was in support of a land-grant university for the District of Columbia. More than 40,000 citizens were represented at these hearings, the record of which has been transmitted to the Congress in support of H.R. 15643.

Postponement of legislative action now can only be viewed as evidencing a lack of awareness of the limitations placed upon the new City Council by Section 602 (a)(3) of Title VI of Public Law 93-198 or an insensitivity to the needs of the new Council and the citizenry to get on with the business of providing quality education as speedily as possible.

Timing is essential and prompt action is necessary if the best interests of the District are to be served. Even if action is taken at once, the earliest point at which budgetary considerations could be applicable would be Fiscal Year 1977 and capital requirements for classrooms laboratories and ancillary space could not be accommodated before that time. The development of programs, temporary facilities, staff and the acquisition of land which has been accomplished since the enactment of Public Law 89-791 in 1966 with respect to the three separate institutions of higher learning must give way to an orderly progression of master planning for a comprehensive higher education program for curriculum, campus facilities and personnel coordinated by a single policy formulation structure.

It is sincerely to be hoped that the Senate will follow the course charted by the House in assisting the District of Columbia to move ahead as effectively and efficiently as possible to bring to the District of Columbia the benefits which the creation of a single land-grant university would make available to the people of the District of Columbia.

It is important to know now in Fiscal Year 1975 that H.R. 15643 will be enacted into law. The existing Board of the three institutions that will give way to the Board of Trustees to be appointed by March 2, 1975 require lead time for policy formulation related to institutional participation in the $3.82 billion Federal program of assistance to higher education. According to the National Science Foundation Report of August 2, 1974, 100 colleges and universities (of which 42 were land-grant institutions) received two thirds of all of the education and research funds allocated in FY 1973 amounting to $2.6 billion.

The orderly processes of master planning programs, facilities and people are indeed time-dependent.

Land-grant universities, by virtue of their designation and specific Federal legislation, participate by formula in the provisions of the Second Morrill Act of 1890, Hatch Act of 1887, Smith-Lever Act of 1914, Bankhead-Jones Act of 1937 and based on their curricula offerings would be in an advantageous position to utilize resources from the Mineral Resources Centers Bill, Environmental Centers Research Bill and the Sea Grant College project activities of the National Science Foundation, McIntyre-Stennis Act of 1961, the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, the Anhydrous Fisheries Program, and the HUD Title VII Urban Fellows Program. Enactment of H.R. 15643 would assure that the citizens of the District would have a federally chartered public university that shares equitably with the public universities of the several states and territories both in status and opportunities afforded for program participation in Federal grant activities.

In summary, we are convinced, that only the Congress can modify the status of the two land-grant colleges in the District of Columbia. Moreover, the citizens have requested that the 93rd Congress so act and affirmative action now will serve the greatest public good placing the new District Government in a positive position to move without delay in assuming its responsibilities under Public Law 93-198.

1959–60	Amount of 1862 land-grant endowment fund—$16,256; income—$275
	Unsold land—26,561 acres; value—undetermined
1961	Alaska State Regents Board approved reorganization along university lines into six academic colleges and division of statewide services (July 1)

Arizona

University of Arizona
Tucson

1885	Territorial legislature authorized State university at Tucson
1891	Legislature accepted provisions of Second Morrill Act of 1890 (March 19)
	University of Arizona opened for instruction (October)
1895	First baccalaureate degree granted
1903	Master's degrees first awarded
1910	With State enabling act, received 150,000 acres of land in lieu of grant under Morrill Act of 1862
1912	State legislature accepted provisions of First Morrill Act of 1862
1922	Ph. D. degrees first conferred
1959–1960	Amount of 1862 land-grant endowment fund—$71,585; income—$29,351
	Unsold—149,405 acres; value—$489,200

Arkansas

University of Arkansas
Fayetteville

1864	State legislature accepted 150,000 acres in land scrip under the First Morrill Act; but because of disturbed conditions caused by the war, another act of the legislature was necessary before the scrip could be issued (May 11)
1867	Legislature acted to issue scrip (January 31)
1871	Legislature again affirmed acceptance of the conditions of the 1862 land-grant act and organized a college, the Arkansas Industrial University at Fayetteville (March 27)
1872	Arkansas Industrial University opened to first students (January 22)
1876	Baccalaureate degrees first granted
1884	Master's degrees first awarded
1891	Legislature accepted provisions of Second Morrill Act and designated eight-elevenths of the funds to Arkansas Industrial University (April 9)
1899	Name changed to University of Arkansas
1953	Doctoral degrees first conferred
1959–60	Amount of 1862 land-grant endowment fund—$133,000; income—$6,633

1891	State accepted provisions of Second Morrill Act (March 31)
1960	Seven campuses: Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Diego (formerly La Jolla), San Francisco, Santa Barbara
1959–60	Amount of 1862 land-grant endowment fund—$990,632; income—$29,642 Unsold—280 acres; value—undetermined

Colorado

Colorado State University
Fort Collins

1870	Territorial legislature established Agricultural College of Colorado (February 11)
1875	Colorado organized into a State by an act of Congress (March 3)
1876	The State admitted to the Union (August 1)
1877	Agricultural College of Colorado was formally organized; State board of agriculture created as governing body
1879	State legislature accepted provisions of Morrill Act of 1862 and was granted 91,600 acres of land in place (January 27) Agricultural College of Colorado opened for instruction (September 1)
1884	First baccalaureate degree granted
1890	Master's degrees first awarded
1891	Provisions of Second Morrill Act of 1890 accepted (April 6)
1935	Name changed to the Colorado State College of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts
1951	Name changed to Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College
1955	Doctoral degree first conferred
1957	Became Colorado State University
1959–60	Amount of 1862 land-grant endowment fund—$722,909; income—$30,507 Unsold—30,000 acres; value—undetermined

Connecticut

University of Connecticut
Storrs

1862	State accepted the Federal grant of 180,000 acres in scrip, thus becoming the third of the three States that accepted the provisions of the First Morrill Act in the year that it was passed (December 24)
1863	All scrip having been sold, the interest from the fund was granted to Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University (June 24)
1881	The Storrs Agricultural School was chartered, and opened for instruction September 28 (April 6)

Hawaii

University of Hawaii
Honolulu

1907	Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (Act 24) established College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts of the Territory of Hawaii, and applied for benefits "which the Federal Government gives to such institutions" (March 25)
1908	By ruling of Secretary of Interior (February 28), the Territory of Hawaii was entitled to participate in the fund created for agricultural colleges by the act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 417), and the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1281)
	Opened for instruction
1911	Name changed to College of Hawaii
1912	First granted baccalaureate degrees
1914	Master's degrees first awarded
1920	Name changed to University of Hawaii
1926	Ph. D. degree first conferred
1928	Public Law No. 395, 70th Cong., approved; to extend the agricultural experiment station laws and cooperative agricultural extension service laws to the Territory of Hawaii (May 16)
1959	State enabling act passed by Congress (March 11–12)
	People of Hawaii accepted statehood (June 27)
1960	The Hawaii Omnibus Act (Public Law 86–624 authorized an appropriation of $6 million to the State of Hawaii subject to the provisions of the First Morrill Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 301–308); the first instance in a which a direct cash appropriation was made as a Morrill Act endowment rather than land or land scrip (July 12)
1961	U.S. Congress apropriated (Public Law 86–722) $2,225,000 to State of Hawaii to carry out the purpose of section 14(e) of Hawaii Omnibus Act (Public Law 86–624)
*	Legislature of the State of Hawaii passed (Act 158) an act "Accepting the Land-Grant Colleges Aid and Designating the University of Hawaii the Beneficiary" (July 8)
1962	U.S. Congress (Public Law 87–290) appropriated $3,775,000, the balance of the amount authorized in the Hawaii Omnibus Act (1960) to complete permanent endowment fund in lieu of land-grant under First Morrill Act

Idaho

University of Idaho
Moscow

1889	University of Idaho, at Moscow, chartered and opened for instruction (January 30)
1890	By State enabling act the State received 90,000 acres of land in lieu of Federal grant of 1862 (July 3)

1925 Junior college work inaugurated

1936 Became Princess Anne College, a division of the University of Maryland, with 4-year curriculums in agriculture, mechanic arts, and home economics

1948 Name changed to Maryland State College, a division of the University of Maryland

Massachusetts

University of Massachusetts
Amherst

1848 Massachusetts Institute of Agriculture chartered by legislature of the Commonwealth, but not established

1856 Massachusetts School of Agriculture chartered by the legislature but not established

1863 Legislature accepted the provisions of the First Morrill Act, and received 360,000 acres in scrip (April 18)

Legislature divided the land-grant fund—one-third of the income for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and two-thirds for the trustees of the Massachusetts Agricultural College (April 27)

Massachusetts School of Agriculture officially abandoned, and a new institution chartered under the name of the Trustees of the Massachusetts Agricultural College (April 29)

1864 Name of new institution changed to Massachusetts Agricultural College, and located at Amherst (May 11)

1867 First students admitted (October 2)

1871 First baccalaureate degrees granted, ranking thus among first 10 present land-grant institutions to grant degrees

1891 State accepted provisions of Second Morrill Act, maintaining division of the funds with Massachusetts Institute of Technology on a two-thirds and one-third basis (June 11)

1896 Master's degrees first awarded

1902 Ph. D. degrees first conferred

1959–60 Amount of 1862 land-grant endowment fund—$146,000; income—$7,300

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge

1861 Massachusetts Institute of Technology chartered as a private corporation by General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts "for the purpose of instituting and maintaining a society of arts, museum of arts, and school of industrial science, and aiding advancement, development and practical application of science in connection with arts, agriculture, manufactures, and commerce" (April 10)

1863 Designated by legislature to receive one-third of the income from the land-grant fund (April 18)

1865 First classes, delayed by Civil War, opened in Boston (February 20)

Senator INOUYE. Our final witness is Mr. Ron M. Linton of the District of Columbia.

STATEMENT OF RON M. LINTON, CITIZEN OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LINTON. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for the opportunity to appear before you.

In lieu of the time, in my previous experience on the Hill, I will ask that my prepared statement be placed in the record.

Senator INOUYE. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. LINTON. I will simply make several observations to you.

MANY DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

I came here intending to ask the committee to file the bill in lieu of home rule coming into being after January 2.

I think that a number of arguments have been made that emphasize that point. Let me only underscore it by saying that even after listening to all that I have heard today, had you had to act on this bill, if there were no home rule. I would agree that there are enough differences of opinion, as you have noted, enough questions of which direction to go in this bill, that it would take a good deal more study than what we have before us at this time. In view of the fact that we are going to have home rule, and that we are going to elect a city council, it would seem to me—given the differences of opinion that have been expressed here—the people of this city have the right to be exposed and to be involved in the resolution of those differences of opinion.

BILL SHOULD BE FILED

As a candidate for that elected city council, I just spent 45 days getting signatures from registered voters in the District of Columbia. Those who have been helping me have been asking those citizens questions about the things going on in the District. I might say there is a strong and hungry attitude on the part of the people of this city to know what is happening in this city—who is making the decisions; what is the basis for these decisions; and for a strong desire to be a party to that decisionmaking. I would hope that the Senate would file this bill, and allow this new city council, which is to be elected by the people to do more than a traditional legislative job of passing legislation, but instead to do more for their people, for the people in the District which have not been engaged or involved in the decisionmaking process, as have the other people in other cities and the other States in this country.

I think the city council will have to face up, to go to the people, to finding ways other than the traditional legislative process of holding hearings, to involve the people, to allow them to understand the issues, and to participate in making the decisions. So I would hope that you will file this bill, and give us the opportunity to see whether or not we can elect 13 responsible individuals who understand the responsibility of the legislative body in a city which has never had self-government, and will not act with haste to insure that not only do we have good elementary education, but good post-secondary education

as well. As a graduate of a land-grant institution, I have a particular understanding and interest in making a landgrant institution functional.

Senator INOUYE. I thank you very much, Mr. Linton. Your statement will be very seriously considered.

Mr. LINTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. Linton's prepared statement follows:]

Statement by

Ron M. Linton

before the
District Committee, United State Senate

on

HR 15643

September 5, 1974

Mr. Chairman:

I am Ron M. Linton. I am here to testify on HR 15643 as a Citizen of the District, as a friend and supporter of Federal City College; and as an individual seeking to be elected to the District's legislative body, the D.C. Council.

I am not going to debate the substance of HR 15643 even though I do have some reservations on the validity of the Merger of the District's three institutions of higher education. I am asking that you not act on this bill because the Community most affected by t s action has not been a party to its preparation nor has it been given adequate opportunity to examine and comment on its merit.

Yet, it deals with an element of the District of particular concern to those of us who are what we call local residents or members of the local community as opposed to the national community.

This bill is not National in scope. It does not apply beyond the borders of the District of Columbia and therefore, I argue that the traditional national legislative procedure is not adequate for considering this measure.

This is a local measure even though the distinguished Chairman of the House District Committee might make it appear not to be so. My good friend, Mr. Diggs, suggests that there is a Federal interest in the quality of education in the District because of the residency of Congress and diplomats and their families and the necessity of making the District a national show place.

Well, I submit that the way to make the District a show place for the country and the world is to let the citizens of this City exercise their constitutional rights and prove they are as capable as citizens anywhere in this country to determine how their local institutions should be managed. And all those who are residents of this community <u>will</u> be afforded the opportunity of participation in the local government.

As for the diplomatic families, I question whether very many are students of Federal City College, Washington Technical Institute, or D.C. Teachers College.

I think the Federal interest or presence argument is specious. In fact, I can think of no more exclusive local concern then the matter of education. Throughout the country the rallying cry has been "education is a local matter." I personally feel that the Congress does have an important and significant role in setting National Educational Policy and creating programs.

But that is not what this bill does. This bill deals with how one community must organize its higher education institutions and how it must run them.

If the bill had been generated through substantial community involvement, it would have been a different matter. Or if there were no local government it would be a different matter.

But the Congress has just enacted home rule for the District and what more appropriate public policy decision for the local legislative body than the relationship and governance of its educational institutions.

Mr. Diggs has said it is important that the university come into existence under a Mandate of Congress for it will not only put the full weight and prestige of the United States behind it; it will also be an indication to the American people that the Congress continues to be concerned about this City -- all aspects of it -- and that while Congress heartedly endorse home rule for the local residents, it nevertheless will continue it's role as protector of the Federal interest.

Let me say that it is insulting to have Congress continually imply that we American Citizens in the District are unconcerned with the Federal interest and cannot be trusted to protect it.

Finally, let me suggest the Congress could have put the full weight and prestige of the United States behind Federal City College, Washington Technical Institute and D.C. Teacher's College by adequately funding these institutions before home rule.

I submit that the best congressional endorsement and commitment to high quality post-secondary education in this our Nation's Capital would be to back-up the action of the elected local government by concurrent resolution.

It has also been argued that this bill should be adopted because citizens and residents of this community urged the Congress to establish the University. That suggests an out pouring of support and interest when in fact the opposite is true.

Further argument has been made that the D.C. Council lacks authority to abolish a presidentially appointed board.

But such argument misses the main point. If home rule is to be an effective partnership with the Congress then the local government should be looked to, to originate public policy covering local interests and this should be supported by appropriate Congressional action.

Thus, if the City Council wants to abolish the Board of Vocational Education in favor of say an elected Board of Regents, then the Congress should support us -- it is a local matter.

Finally, I do not understand the urgency of this bill. The new elected City Government will take office January 2. That certainly is not so far in the future that this matter can not wait.

Recently I sought enactment of a bill to extend coverage of the Federal Employees compensation Act so that its provisions in cases of injury or death would apply to Metropolitan Police Reserve Officers while on duty. These men and women - more than 250 of them volunteer their time -- are not protected in case of injury or death. But I was told that that should be taken care of by the newly elected City Council.

If a bill protecting citizens doing public service duty can be left to the City Council then certainly a bill dealing with institutional reorganization can be left to the City Council.

Let the newly elected City Council consider this matter - hold public hearings, involve citizens of the District, and determine what the Community needs.

Senator INOUYE. The committee will stand in adjournment; however, the files will be open for 2 weeks to receive further statements if witnesses so desire to submit them; and until then, the committee will not act. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., the committee adjourned.]

[Subsequent to the hearing the following material was received:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PAUL PHILLIPS COOKE, NATIONAL BOARD MEMBER, AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE (RETIRED PRESIDENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS COLLEGE)

Members of the Senate District Committee,

My name is Paul Phillips Cooke, speaking as a citizen and representing the American Veterans Committee (AVC) as former National Chairman and currently member of the National Board. I am also a former President of the District of Columbia Teachers College, having served in that position for eight years (1966–74) and an additional twenty-two years at the institution, including assignments as Dean of the College (Acting) and Professor of English.

May I commend the Committee for consideration of authorization of a University of the District of Columbia, I offer the following statement for the consideration of the Committee.

1. *Need in the District.* This city needs and will benefit greatly from the proposed University of the District of Columbia.

2. *Public and Private.* Creation of a public university, such as the University of the District of Columbia, is not a threat to the private universities in the District of Columbia.

3. *The College of Education.* The District of Columbia Teachers College should develop into a college of education in the University.

4. *A single board.* One board of governance for higher education in the District of Columbia is essential and is properly provided for in the legislation before the Committee.

5. *The Composition of the Board of governance.* The Board should have and will benefit from a membership of fifteen persons including one student, one faculty member, one alumnus.

1. NEED FOR A UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The District of Columbia needs and will benefit greatly from the proposed University of the District of Columbia.

The University of the District of Columbia is needed to pull together the existing three institutions of higher education—the District of Columbia Teachers College, the Federal City College, and the Washington Technical Institute. The University is also needed to provide broader public higher education for men and women who do not and ordinarily would not turn to the private universities. The University is needed in the Nation's Capital as all the fifty states have also concluded.

In testimony before the District of Columbia City Council in 1970, I recommended a university structure. (A copy of the statement is attached.) I have every reason after four years to conclude that the city continues to require a university structure and program unity to accomplish, among other things, the elimination of unnecessary duplication and to provide the broadest possible offering.

2. PUBLIC AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES

Creation of a public university, such as the University of the District of Columbia, is not a threat to private universities in the District of Columbia.

Primarily because the students to be served in the great majority by the proposed University of the District of Columbia are not the students enrolled in the private universities. The public and private universities will not conflict. The University of the District of Columbia will not adversely affect the private universities and colleges. The great number of students now who are not served and who should be served by higher education in the Nation's Capital will be served by the new University of the District of Columbia.

The private universities will continue to draw from all over the nation, indeed from all over the world. The private universities will continue to enroll students with financial resources making it possible for them to enroll in the high-tuition institutions.

Although increasingly conscious of the urban problems and needs of urban students, the private institutions have not in the past enrolled any substantial number of students from Washington, D.C. The University of the District of Columbia will attract those students.

There is a place for both the public and private institutions.

3. TEACHERS COLLEGE AS THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

The University of the District of Columbia should include a college of education, which should be developed from the District of Columbia Teachers College.

H.R. 15643 provides that the existing colleges—District of Columbia Teachers College, Federal City College, and Washington Technical Institute—be abolished; these institutions would then constitute the basic structure of the University of the District of Columbia. The Board of Higher Education has proposed that the Teachers College be the nucleus of the College of Education, Federal City College the nucleus of the College of Liberal And Fine Arts, and the Washngton Technical Institute nucleus of the College of Science and Technology. The Board of Vocational Education has accepted that recommendation.

My conviction is that the now existing institutions should become the college structures in the University. The current action of the Board of Higher Education to merge the Teachers College and Federal City College, however, may prevent that development from taking place.

The Board should not now merge the two institutions. Whether the Board has authority to end the existence of the Teachers College, which was established by the Congress in 1929, is a question. Whether in the absence of specific authority the Board can merge the institutions is also a question. Equally important is the matter of logic and common sense raised by an action to merge the two institutions, which within a year would be the nucleus colleges for education and arts.

This statement is an expression of hope that the Subcommittee will review the merger, or absorption, effort of the Board.

4. ONE BOARD OF GOVERNANCE

One board of governance for higher education in the District of Columbia is an essential and is properly provided for in H.R. 15643.

H.R. 15643 provided for one board to replace the present two boards. That provision is good, justifiable in view of the one institution, a proposed university, and necessary in light of the history of two boards.

It is regrettable that the intent of the Committee Rough Discussion Draft to bring together all public education cannot at this time be achieved.

The one board is necessary to set policy for a university. Although the different colleges proposed to compose the university have different content and objectives, one board will serve to unify the entire institution, coordinate program, sharpen management and administration, provide for expansion where appropriate and eliminate duplication that is unnecessary.

In 1969 and 1970 the present boards with the District of Columbia Board of Education did establish a "Liaison Committee" organized to accomplish some of the goals noted in the previous sentence. That group, which included the three college presidents and the school superintendent, however, had not met since 1970.

Representatives of the two college boards have held meetings in 1973–74. The group was able to reach accord on the need for the University of the District of Columbia.

Nevertheless, I conclude that one board is a valid instrument for setting policy for the new university.

5. COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The composition of the board of governance should have and will benefit from a membership of fifteen persons including one student, one faculty member, one alumnus.

A fifteen-member board would benefit from inclusion of one student, one faculty member, one alumnus. The board would have twelve members from other areas of life, if concern exists over the possibility of board control by student-faculty-alumnus vested interest.

For several years now the Board of Higher Education has functioned with faculty representatives and student representatives from the District of Columbia Teachers College and Federal City College. Their service has been of value to the Board and to their respective student bodies and faculties. The Teachers College during this span of years has had three Faculty Representatives—Professors Elgy S. Johnson, Sarah M. Pereira, and Estelle W. Taylor. Each has served on the Board without vote and on Board subcommittees. The Board is the better for their contribution. Similarly, the three Teachers College student representatives—Vincent S. Jones, Linda Price, and Vernon Sewell—have also so served that the Board benefits.

Legislation should authorize their membership on the Board of Trustees.

* * * * * * *

Congress should act now to authorize the new University. The House has acted; the legislation process is moving. Opportunity for a new public university now exists. The process should not be delayed; the matter should not be referred to the mayor and a City Council, which will have so much to do for the city. The City Council does not need to have the city university as another issue. The Senate District Committee should move now to approve legislation for the new university.

In summary, I urge the Subcommittee to support the legislation for the new University of the District of Columbia.

○